

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

NO. LVI...JUNE, 1849.

ARTICLE I.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

1. *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution.* 1614—1661. Edited for the Hanserd Knolly's Society, with an Introduction, by EDWARD BEAN UNDERHILL, London, 1846.
2. *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed*, by ROGER WILLIAMS—with a biographical Introduction, by ED. B. UNDERHILL, London, 1848.
3. *Essay on the Union of Church and State*, by BAPTIST W. NOEL, London. New York: Harper's reprint, 1849.

THE impartial and comprehensive history of religious freedom in modern times, cannot fail to make honorable mention of the early and uniform efforts of the Baptists for its promotion. It is one of their marked characteristics, that they have never persecuted for religious differences. The rights of conscience they have undeviatingly respected. Having known by their hard experience, in the old world and the new, the bitter effects of bigoted intolerance, they have, when in power, been mercifully preserved from the inconsistency which, alas, is too common, of practising the evils on others, which they complained of when inflicted on themselves. It cannot but be grateful to them, and instructive to others, to trace some of the steps of the progressive development of

their efforts for the promotion of soul-liberty in England and America. Especially at a time like this, when so large a part of the civilized world are led to regard with deep and absorbing interest the rights and securities for the unmolested exercise of the conscience, any traces of past successful labors in this great cause, cannot but be invested with surpassing attractiveness.

X The *so called* reformation in England under Henry VIII., which mainly consisted in renouncing a pope at Rome in order to substitute a similar head of the church in the person of the monarch himself, was far enough from satisfactory to those who loved the scriptural exercises of pure and simple Christianity. Accordingly we find, throughout the reigns of Henry VIII., of his son Edward, and for a long period afterwards, an increasing number of disciples, who loved and adhered to the truths of the Bible, suffering bitter persecution for conscience' sake. Against the Baptists especially did the vindictive rage of princes and prelates expend itself with utmost fury. Scores of this peaceable people, in no way offending but that they faithfully adhered to the law of their God, were cruelly put to death for their religion. Many more had full experience of bonds and imprisonment, of cruel mockings and scourgings, while others escaped these inflictions only by exile from their native land. All this manifestly proceeded from the purblind views of those calling themselves Reformers and Protestants. It showed conclusively how inadequate that reformation was, which failed to recognise the fundamental principle so distinctly enunciated by Jesus Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world—If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." So distinctly were the lines drawn between the professed and real reformers, that it has been emphatically declared, by a writer thoroughly acquainted with this subject, that "There is not a confession of faith, nor a creed framed by any of the reformers of this period, which does not give to the magistrate a coercive power in religion; and almost every one at the same time curses the resisting Baptist." This denomination, from radically different views of the nature and constituents of Christ's visible kingdom, were led to repudiate all physical force in its upbuilding and defence. They did not, as their persecutors industriously misrepresented them, deny the rightfulness of civil government in all secular concerns;

but they nobly and truthfully resisted the right of the civil magistracy to all interference in the affairs of conscience. Their motto they had learned from the lips of their Master—"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

It was not until they had long and patiently suffered, and many of their number had sealed with their blood the martyr-testimony they had to bear for God's precious truth, that any of them attempted to present a written appeal against the principles and practices of their persecutors. The merit is certainly theirs, of having been the first* to separate from the corrupt established Church of England, and worship God in congregations assembled by themselves; nor is their title less clear to having first advocated, in documents which have come down to us, (several of which are reprinted in the first of the volumes named at the head of this article,) the inalienable rights of man's religious nature. We shall doubtless perform an acceptable service to our readers, in making them, to some limited extent, acquainted with the character of these early writings in advocacy of religious liberty.

The volume entitled "*Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*" contains seven distinct treatises, written by persecuted Baptists in the earlier half of the seventeenth century. They are now reprinted, together with such explanatory notes and introductions as serve to give the modern reader a clearer idea of the circumstances of the several writers, and the occasions of their original publications. Most instructive, timely, and satisfactory is the exhibit made in this volume, of what the Baptists have often claimed, and their opponents, in this country especially, as often denied, that previously to the settlement of these New England Colonies by the pilgrims, and the inconsistent spectacle they exhibited of professing to flee from religious persecution, and then turning persecutors themselves, the principles of religious freedom were well understood and openly advocated by those whom they reviled and oppressed.† The extenuating plea now offered for the persecuting spirit of many of the fathers of New England—"that it was the fault of the age, that the

* See *Strype Memor* II. i. 369.

† See Dr. Worcester's *Plymouth Discourse*, and the *Christian Observatory*.

light of religious liberty had not then dawned"—is but in part true. It had arose and shined, but their darkness comprehended it not. Even so good a man as Robinson, pastor of the church at Leyden—a part of which church furnished the earliest band of emigrants, the germ of the Plymouth Colony—was himself a controversialist on the wrong side, somewhat virulently opposing Mr. Helwys, the pastor of a Baptist church in London early in the seventeenth century, for maintaining that the civil magistrate had no right to interfere and molest or punish men for their religious belief and practices. The second of the tracts in the volume now under consideration, was written for the refutation of this publication of Robinson's.

We will furnish some notice of these several tracts in the chronological order of their publication. The first is a brief dissertation called *Religion's Peace: or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience*, presented to King James and the high court of Parliament, by Leonard Busher, citizen of London—printed in the year 1614. It may be presumed that this faithful and earnest plea had, for the time, some favorable influence on the mind of the king; for, on opening his parliament that year, he says: "No state can evidence that any religion or heresy was ever extirpated by the sword or by violence, nor have I ever judged it a way of planting the truth. An example of this I take where, when many rigorous counsels were propounded, Gamaliel stood up and advised that 'if that religion were of God, it would prosper; if of man, it would finish of itself.'" Deeply must it be regretted that the monarch's practice did not agree with his words.

This little work of Busher's is *the earliest English treatise known to be now extant*, boldly and fully advocating the rights of conscience. As such it deserves a fuller notice than our space may allow for some others of this series. It was reprinted in 1646, at London, with an address prefixed, "To the Presbyterian Reader." It is in quarto, the preliminary address to the Presbyterians (then in the ascendancy in the State and too much inclined to persecution) occupying four pages, and Busher's treatise thirty-eight. We make a few extracts from the address prefixed; which, having been written by a Presbyterian or Independent, bears an honorable and disinterested testimony for the treatise and its humble author.

“Leonard Busher, the author, an honest and godly man, as I make no doubt will appear to you in the perusal of his book, intended two things therein. First, to make it appear that the bishops were not true ministers or successive from the apostles, but rather a scion or branch of the popish stock, descended from the Romish hierarchy, to whom they owed their instauration, ordination, and function.

The second thing his discourse drives at, is to make it appear, by Scripture and sound arguments, that the only way to make a nation happy, and preserve the people in love, peace, and tranquillity, is to give liberty to all to serve God according as they are persuaded is most agreeable to his word; to speak, write, print peaceably and without molestation, in behalf of their several tenets and ways of worship, wholesome and pertinent laws being made upon penalties, to restrain all kinds of vice or violence, all kinds of reproach, slander, or injury, either by word or deed. And though this advice seems not the best to some, especially to you my brethren in the Presbyterian way, yet am I well assured that this nation will never be happy; but as hitherto it hath been, so for the future it will be, distracted with oppression and persecution, and the faces of one sort of men set against another, till liberty of conscience be allowed.”

This generous mediator, in his endeavor to conciliate his reluctant Presbyterian brethren to the truth and safety of the principles of Busher's treatise, goes on thus to argue with them.

“The plea for liberty of conscience is no new doctrine; as old certainly as the blessed word of God itself, which gives us this immovable foundation thereof:—that every man should be fully persuaded of the truth of that way wherein he serves the Lord. And though there have been strugglings in all ages to make good this blessed birthright to all people, yet through the potency and subtlety of popes, bishops, and ministers that preferred the advance of themselves and their usurped and abused function, before the good and welfare of the people, we have been deprived of this blessing, next to the manifestation of God's love and goodness to us, the most excellent and desirable in the world. * * * * Hence it is that instead of peace, we have frequently had the sword; instead of sweet tranquillity, love, and affection,—hatred, contention, disaffection, and the bitter fruits thereof, have reigned among us; and in all probability will reign, till God shall put it into the heart of the parliament to make trial, for the prevention thereof, of this godlike way, which in the ensuing treatise is held forth. I hope upon perusal thereof, you that are my brethren of the Presbyterian way,

will abate much of your misguided eagerness in persecuting your conscientious brethren."

The salutation of the author of the treatise, "to the High and Mighty King James, and to the Princely and Right Honorable Parliament," is thus quaintly expressed: "LEONARD BUSHER wisheth the wisdom of Solomon, the zeal of Josias, and the mercy of Christ, with the salvation of your spirits in the day of the Lord Jesus."

We have not room for a full analysis, but there is an argument or analogy stated from a high antiquity which seems somewhat original, as follows:

"As Abel killed not Cain, but was killed by him, and as Isaac and Jacob did not persecute Ishmael and Esau, but were persecuted of them—who and Cain were figures of all persecutors—so the believing do not persecute the unbelieving, nor the true church the false; but the believing and true church are persecuted by the false. Of whom Abel, Isaac and Jacob were figures, whose children are all believers and freemen, that stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and will not be tangled with the yoke of bondage. No, not with circumcision, much less with the discipline and doctrine of the church of Rome, whose bishops are able ministers of the fire and sword, as many histories do witness, to their utter infamy and overthrow."

The manner in which he shows the inconsistency of the dogma of persecution, with the apostolic injunctions for husbands to live with their unbelieving wives, and wives with their unbelieving husbands, is clear and conclusive. The method by which he would shame persecutors, holding up in contrast with their practice the greater tolerance of Mohammedans, must have caused some to blush. With emphasis he asks, "*Shall we be less tolerant than the Turks?*"

The main body of this treatise contains seventeen distinct reasons against persecution, and seven principal advantages of religious freedom. We should like to give at least the analysis of them all, but cannot afford room for them. Two paragraphs towards the close of his treatise we insert for their intrinsic interest, and as specimens of the author's style, simple, perspicuous, but lively and energetic also.

"Another reason why so many good people are now deceived is,

because we that have most truth, are persecuted, and, therefore, most poor. Whereby we are unable to write and print, as we would, against the adversaries of the truth. It is hard to get our daily bread with the labors of our weak bodies and feeble hands. How then should we have to defray other charges, and to write and print? I have, through the help of God, out of his word made a scourge of small cords, wherewith antichrist and his ministers might be driven out of the temple of God. Also a declaration of certain false translations in the New Testament. But I want wherewith to print and publish them. Therefore must they rest, till the Lord seeth good to supply it."

The hints thus incidentally furnished of poor, persecuted, but indefatigable Busher, are precious, as throwing some little light on his personal history. They show, too, that the Baptists of that early day — but three years after King James's version of the Scriptures was first sent forth — complained of the mistranslations in the New Testament. Then, alas! they were too poor to print the corrections which truth required. But while patiently disposed to "bide their time," they did not, and still do not despair. They then believed, and still believe, that truth is mighty and will prevail.

Our other extract from this treatise relates to one of the incidental incongruities of a persecuting, prelatical church, when compared with the example of Christ and the apostles.

"Christ will have his ministers preach to such as are worthy and willing, and not as your ministers, who come to them they hold unworthy and find unwilling, and say, 'Will you not come to church and hear, and will ye not believe our doctrine? but we will make you, or else we will burn you for heretics.' Thus will they taunt meek and holy Christians, who are torn like sheep among the wolves. But Christ's ministers will with meekness instruct such as are contrary minded, tolerating the evil men patiently; proving, if God will at any time give them repentance, that they may know the truth. Whereby they show plainly that they are Christ's disciples, and have that true faith which worketh by love, even as the apostle saith: The which I pray you to consider, that so you may both know and obey the will of Christ."

The second tract included in this volume, is anonymous, but was obviously written by an intelligent and bold member of the Baptist Church in London, some of whose members, with Mr. Helwys [often spelled Helwysse], their pastor, return-

ed from Holland after the death of his predecessor, Mr. John Smyth. It was occasioned by some controversial treatise of John Robinson of Leyden, who had attacked the confession of faith of his Baptist brethren. Their confession of faith was published in 1611. Three years afterward, Robinson published his survey of this confession of faith, in which he advocated persecution, by the civil magistrate, of those who departed from the truth — i. e. *the truth* as he understood it. This tract, issued in 1615, is expressly declared in the last paragraph to have originated in the purpose to answer a late book of John Robinson. The form of dialogue is adopted, in order to bring out and fairly confute the various objections urged against the Baptist doctrine of religious liberty.

We scarcely need do more than give the title page in full. It stands as follows in the reprint of 1662, which seems to have been the *third* edition.

“Persecution for Religion judged and condemned; in a discourse between Anti-christian and a Christian, proving, by the law of God and of the land, And by King James his many testimonies, that no man ought to be persecuted for his religion, so he testifie his allegiance by the oath appointed by law. Proving also that the spiritual power in England is the image of the spiritual cruel power of Rome, or that Beast mentioned Rev. 13. Manifesting the fearful estate of those who subject to such powers that tyrannize over the conscience: And showing the unlawfulness of flying, because of the trouble men see or fear is coming upon them.

2 Cor. 10 : 4. *For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds.*

Printed in the years 1615 and 1620. And now reprinted for the establishing of some, and convincing others. 1662.

So full a title page might well supersede any other table of contents. The dialogue is well sustained, and the whole treatise would be regarded, even in our own day, as creditable to the head and heart of the author.

The third tract is “A most humble supplication of many of his Majesty’s loyal subjects, persecuted only for difference in religion, contrary to divine and human testimonies — printed in 1620.”

It comprises ten chapters, is ably, and in some parts eloquently written, and was no doubt designed to be laid before the parliament, which the king that year perforce was led to call. But it secured no consideration, and persecution for conscience' sake continued.

In 1647, during the Protectorate of Cromwell, at a period when the Presbyterians were exerting themselves to the utmost to gain the entire ascendancy in Church and State, and to enforce uniformity on their basis, Samuel Richardson, one of the Baptist ministers in London, issued a quarto pamphlet of 44 pages, on "The necessity of Toleration in matters of religion." This forms the fourth of the tracts in this volume. It contains seventy questions, whether corporal punishments ought to be inflicted upon such as hold errors in religion — propounded to the synod, and all honest-hearted and conscientious people.

Next, there is the discussion of the relation of magistrates as members of the Church. Then follows the Non-Conformists' answer, why they cannot receive and submit to certain articles of the Presbyterian faith. In "the conclusion," is contained a brief but pungent invective, addressed to those who were then striving to lord it over God's heritage.

No sooner was Charles II. restored to his ancestral throne, than the persecutions of the Baptists were recommenced. The next tract here inserted, is "The humble petition and representation of several inhabitants of the County of Kent, imprisoned in the Gaol of Maidstone for the testimony of a good conscience." This was in the year 1660: and these incarcerated Baptists plead their cause in a noble, manly, and most capable manner. It availed them little, however, with their perfidious monarch. His fair words were always the counterpart of his cruel and persecuting acts which they belied.

The sixth tract here found, is a plea for toleration, addressed to the king, the following year, by John Sturghion, a member of the baptised people. It would seem that this individual thought himself entitled, for his active efforts to bring the king back, to some special consideration. His plea of course failed, though its intrinsic weight deserved a better fate.

The last of these interesting tracts, published in the same year, 1661, is entitled "Sion's Groans for her Distressed; or

sober endeavors to prevent innocent blood." It is signed by seven Baptist ministers, and contains a clear digest of the arguments against persecution, expressed with great energy and pathos. It embraces some extracts from Jeremy Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying." As he was a churchman, and now a bishop, they hoped his words might avail.

With pleasure we turn from the buffetings of this glorious spirit of religious freedom in the old world, to its more successful achievement in the new. In point of time, the experiment of Roger Williams, illustrating the safety and beneficence of leaving the conscience free, was made in the midst of the period embraced by the tracts in the volume just examined. But it was in America, not in England. On the contrary, the advocacy of this stupendous demonstration had to appear—as it was in fact composed—in and about London, in the year 1644. In the previous year, Williams,—of whose emigration to this country, his banishment by Massachusetts, and the founding under his auspices of the first civil government in modern times, where full religious liberty was recognized and secured, we need not here speak more particularly,—had been driven by the intolerant spirit of the other colonies, (whose confederacy for mutual defence against the Indians, Rhode Island was not allowed to join, because she would not consent to the unholy union of Church and State,) to repair to England and secure the advantages of a charter from the mother country. He arrived at a propitious period, and by the aid of his ever liberal and devoted friend, Sir Henry Vane, he secured such a charter as he desired, giving full powers to the people, for all appropriate purposes of civil government; and while thus yielding to Cæsar the things which are his, guarded against invasion the rights of man and the claims of God.

It was while this indefatigable champion of soul-freedom was engrossed with the anxious and complicated duties of this embassy, which had been intrusted to him by his fellow colonists, that he found time to write the second volume, named at the head of this article, "The Bloody Tenet of Persecution for Cause of Conscience." Not unlikely he was incited to this performance by his friend Vane, who, having resided in Massachusetts long enough to know the spirit of its ecclesiastical and persecuting leaders, may rea-

sonably have wished to secure some efficient antidote against the efforts of Mr. Cotton and the other advocates of intolerance, whose persevering endeavors to sugar over the poison of their own cruel practices by the seeming piety of their intent, were in danger of corrupting the minds of men, both in the old country and the new. It must be regarded as by far the fullest and ablest of the treatises which advocated this then very unpopular doctrine. The fact that it was originally published in London without the name of either author or publisher attached to it; that it was most offensive to the various parties into which the ruling powers of the State were then divided; and that to this day it has never been reprinted in this country, though the principles and cause which it advocated have here been so triumphantly victorious, must be regarded as among the anomalies of literature. We may be allowed a few words on each of these interesting points.

That Roger Williams was the man to shrink in any spirit of craven recreancy from affixing his name to this noble embodiment of his doctrines, none who read his life will for one moment suspect. Why, then, this anonymous issue of the Bloody Tenet? The reason may readily be found in that consummate wisdom, that far-seeing prudence and self-abnegation, which cared incomparably more for principles than for persons, was more concerned for the successful result of what was adapted to glorify God and the gospel, and to bless the world, than for any distinction which might enure to the instrument of this glorious deliverance. It should be remembered that Williams was now an outlaw, banished by those who had great influence at court, undistinguished by any signal success, hunted by the malignant spirit of detraction, his experiment of the government of his colony, unconnected with church rule, as yet problematical; there was certainly every reason why he should not wish to imperil the cause which was so dear to him, by identifying his name with the treatise he sent forth. Like Paul, who omitted his name in the letter to the Hebrews, lest he should hinder his prejudiced kinsmen according to the flesh from the cordial reception of the gospel; so Williams would gladly sink himself to advance the cause of truth and bless his fellow-men. Perhaps, too, the fear of endangering the cause entrusted to him by his fellow-colonists, in connection with

their charter, may have coöperated with the above reasons to induce the withholding of his name as the author of the volume.

Whatever was the cause, there can be no doubt of the fact, that prelatists, Presbyterians, and Independents of that day, joined in execrating "the Anabaptist heresy and pest," as they chose to denominate the doctrine of the "Bloody Tenet." x That the Episcopal church, wedded to the state by so many golden, honorable, and powerful ties, should oppose Williams's doctrine was very natural. But the Presbyterians, too, exclaimed against it as full of heresy and blasphemy. They even proceeded so far as to burn it, to increase the popular odium against it. This may account for the extreme rarity of that first edition, not more than three or four copies of the work being now attainable either in England or America. From Baillie and Hanbury we learn that the work did not meet with the approbation of the English Independents. Its principles of religious freedom were too full for their plan. They might be induced to *tolerate* those who were sound in fundamentals. But then the very right to tolerate, implied the power and the qualified disposition to persecute, also. And the questions as to what should be esteemed fundamentals, and who were sound in them, being left in their keeping, would necessarily open the door to endless mischief. The Congregationalists of this country, in that and several generations afterwards, vaunted their liberality in tolerating those who were sound in fundamentals; the practical illustration of which is found in the whipping, fining, imprisonment, and banishing of the Baptists, and in the same indignities, together with cropping and hanging of the Quakers. The world has seen enough of such toleration. Indeed, the very word, and the idea it necessarily suggests, are unfit concomitants for an age and a country where religious rights and soul-liberty flourish.

Why the book under consideration was not allowed to be published or much circulated in that day among the church and state colonies of New England, is not strange. It would have been as great a marvel had the powers in the ascendant tolerated such an innovation, as for the Ephesian craftsmen to look on unmoved when the apostles were successfully proclaiming the gospel in their midst. The wealth, the honor, the power of these usurpers of Christ's prerogative, were

all in danger, when this barley loaf came tumbling into their camp, and smote and demolished one after another of their strongholds. The advocacy of these free principles and practices, though it was hindered, so far as this and kindred publications were concerned, has been, on the whole, however, more efficiently accomplished by the example of a free, prosperous State, repudiating all persecuting measures, when viewed in contrast with her neighbors, still cleaving to them. Let us glance at their history.

The colony of Rhode Island had from the first adopted principles and policy utterly unlike her neighbors, Massachusetts and Connecticut, by whose extending borders her own narrow territory is embosomed and almost swallowed up. They were determined to link Church and State by indissoluble ties, — to make the ecclesiastical authority the exponent, the centre, and the limitation of the civil — the magic wand, by which alternately to exorcise and control the State; while out of gratitude for such a pious care, the magistracy was to coöperate with the priesthood in branding, imprisoning, and banishing for alleged heresy. And if the banished persisted in returning to their jurisdiction against their anathematizing decrees, hanging, as in the case of the Quakers, should be the final and efficient remedy. On the contrary, Rhode Island asserted, from the very first, perfect liberty of conscience, determining “to hold forth a lively experiment that a most flourishing civil State may stand, and best be maintained, with a full liberty in religious concernments.” (See petition of the colonists for their charter.)

At the end of two centuries we look for the results of principles, thus widely different in these contiguous States. We find Rhode Island still adhering to the impregnable ground of religious liberty, assumed at the first in the midst of obloquy, rejoicing in having been able to carry out the noble plans of her illustrious founders, notwithstanding the intimidation and flattery by which her neighbors had endeavored either to drive or seduce her from them. Eminently prosperous and happy at home, she has become increasingly respected abroad, and has enjoyed the rare satisfaction of seeing all her sister States, one after another, adopt her principles and profit by her example. At this time, notwithstanding her poor and scanty territory, she presents the spectacle of a more dense population to the square mile, and probably

greater proportional wealth, than any other State in the Union. Her inhabitants can rejoice in lighter taxes and more uniform general industry than her neighbors, with an equal degree of intelligence, probity, and public spirit. While the arts have flourished, and toil and enterprise yielded their generous recompense, religion, without sectarianism or hypocrisy, has had free course, and wrought its blessed results in the hearts and lives of thousands of its votaries. There need be here no straining a point to its utmost capacity to make out a case ; for the simple, unvarnished story of the steady progress of this little State in all that can ennoble and bless, is her best eulogy. Nor, in reverting to the results of a contrary policy in her neighbors, is it necessary to dwell on those things most derogatory to their character, or wounding to their pride. Massachusetts and Connecticut tried the experiment of law religion, and church interference in government ; tried it in the most favorable circumstances, and for a length of time amply sufficient to learn its general tendency. They have seen one after another of their associate States among " the old thirteen," abandon and repudiate the unnatural and unholy coalition, and adopt the policy of that neighbor which they had so long sneered at, and attempted to blacken with opprobrium. In the mean time, a larger number of new States, as younger sisters of the confederacy, have risen into being, and without exception have adopted the model of Rhode Island in their plan of governmental non-interference in religion ; till at last Massachusetts and Connecticut were left alone in the unenviable singularity of the tenaciousness with which they grasped after some symbol of a Jewish theocracy, and their own children have risen up and decided the question against their ancient assumption ; so that even these States themselves have now wiped out the statutes, if not the stain, of their former errors. Could the triumph of right over might be more complete ? If aught is still lacking in the entireness of that ascendancy of the principles of religious freedom which Rhode Island first adopted, it is their reflex influence on the parent country. Even there, — time-honored and entrenched as the corrupting alliance of state union and state patronage with religion has been, — the foundations of the colossal evil are beginning to be upheaved, and cheering indications greet the eye and gladden the heart of every friend of religion and of Britain's

true welfare, that the day of redemption from this grinding oppression of one-half of her population, who are taxed against their consent to vitiate and degrade the religion of the other half, is now drawing to a close.

When that reform shall be complete, and Britain and all her colonies have cast off the incubus of a state religion, then, wherever the English language is spoken, and where religion in its greatest purity and power prevails, there will the fair example of this small State be reflected in the rich blessings which she has so efficiently helped to secure. This will evince most triumphantly the justice of the claim set forth with such glowing eloquence, and truthful, profound philosophy, by the historian Bancroft; for an equal or superior rank among the benefactors of mankind to be awarded to the founder of Rhode Island with that which is so cheerfully given in another field to Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton.

This triumph of Williams has, therefore, been mainly secured, not by reasoning, and eloquence, and abstruse speculation, but by right action. Like some of the disciples of Christ in the earliest ages, whose simple remark was — "We are not gifted with powers of oratory to plead for our blessed Master's cause, — we cannot speak eloquently, or write persuasively, but we can live for Christ, or die for Christ;" so did the founders of a little State in the wilds of North America, more than two hundred years ago, nobly determine to live, and, if need be, die for those principles which God has, by their example, spread through this great continent. What an appeal does this success of right against might now send forth to the struggling nations! How potent the voice which it lifts up all over the globe, wherever civilized man dwells, to call the governed to claim religious liberty as their inalienable right! If governments understand their interests as well as their duties, how surely will the admonitions of the past shed on them a beacon light, warning them not to interfere with God's rights and claims in their subjects.

By this we mean no disparagement, certainly, to this noble volume of Roger Williams's, which is deserving of the high reputation very uniformly awarded to it by the few who have carefully perused it. Until the reprint of it by the Hanserd Knolly's Society in England the last year, it was nearly inaccessible to the public. This handsome 8 vo. vol-

ume of nearly 500 pages, has an admirable biographical introduction, chiefly compiled from the Memoirs of Knowles and Gammel, to which the indebtedness is courteously acknowledged.

Subjoined to the principal treatise, there is also "*Mr. Cotton's letter, lately printed, examined and answered by Roger Williams of Providence in New England*, London, imprinted in the year 1644." This letter of Mr. Cotton's was one which he wrote to Williams soon after his banishment, and was intended to be partly exculpatory of himself in that transaction, and partly his justification for what he could not deny that he had advised. Williams in this mild but searching examination and answer, scatters the flimsy veil of his adversary. It will richly repay perusal.

The Bloody Tenet itself comprises no less than 138 short chapters, written in dialogue form between Truth and Peace. It frequently evinces beauty and sweetness of no common order, is full of apt learning, and especially shows intimate acquaintance with the word of God. We cannot but hope that some enterprising publisher will be induced to issue an edition of this volume, just as it came from the press of the London Society. Sure we are it would meet with a ready sale, and could not fail to be useful. It seems to be, moreover, a meet tribute to the primitive champion of this great cause, that those who are so immensely benefited by his example and writings should perpetuate the knowledge of both.

Mr. Knowles in his memoir has conclusively shown his indisputable right to the precedence, as an advocate of religious liberty, to Jeremy Taylor, Milton and Locke—and how entirely his example of religious freedom in Rhode Island, eclipses that of partial toleration in Maryland.

There remains for our further notice in this connection, only the last of the volumes named at the head of this article, the Essay of the Hon. and Reverend Baptist W. Noel on the Union of Church and State. On its first perusal, we were fully impressed with its adaptedness to produce a deep sensation in England. Nor have we been surprised to learn that large editions in quick succession have there been called for, and eagerly perused. Coming from a member of one of the families of the nobility, himself a very amiable and attractive man, more than ordinarily beloved and confided in by the

evangelical or low church party in the English ecclesiastical establishment, whatever he might say on so grave and important a topic would be likely to secure a favorable hearing. Nor has the work been marred in his hands: it is worthy of its author and of the occasion which demanded it. True there may not, in the argument of the first part, be much that is new to us of this country, and especially to the early and steadfast advocates of entire separation of Church and State, with whom it is our happiness to be identified. His views on this subject are in full harmony with all the principles and practices of the Baptist Churches from the beginning. Still it will not be less welcome to them than to others to hail so dignified and efficient a coadjutor. In the stand-point whence he directs his assaults on the hoary abuse, and the corrupting alliance of Christ with Belial, it may reasonably be hoped that his missiles will reach farther and hit harder than our light skirmishing. Nor will we forbid his casting out demons in our Master's name, though he follow not with us. By whatever hand this Dagon falls before the ark of gospel truth and soul-freedom, we will cordially exult in its prostration.

The relation which the separation of Church and State sustains toward the more general question of religious liberty, is that of a part to the whole, of one among several causes, tending to this common result. It is quite possible, certainly, for this unblest union to be dissolved, and persecution still be employed to hinder the exercise of each individual's rights of conscience. A thoroughly infidel government might be monstrously oppressive, without any alliance with religion under any form. But such instances in the world's history have been rare. It is, moreover, indisputable that a religious establishment may remain in connection with, and patronized by, the State, and the hindrance to religious liberty be but slight. But trifling though it may seem, this union, whether slight or close, invades a principle, and sooner or later brings practical burdens and hindrances on those not embraced in it, quite incompatible with freedom. Thus the charter, under which the late dynasty governed France, secured, as its framers certainly intended, full liberty of conscience for all the citizens. But the king and court became each year more and more closely drawn into the embraces of the Catholic or established church. They wished to gratify the stipendiaries of this establishment, that they might secure

their political influence. Hence originated the purpose of *regulating* the religious liberty granted by the charter; this was, in other words, *restraining* and *limiting* it, which went on from one vexatious step to another, till it took on the form of oppression and persecution. If the accounts we have received are reliable, this audacity at length went so far as to corrupt and sway the courts of justice.

No wonder that such waywardness plucked down ruin, fearful and irretrievable, on the hoary heads of its authors. But after the anarchy and bloodshed of the recent revolution, what has France gained in this respect? Will not any intriguing administration of the government under the recently formed Constitution, feel warranted to attempt the tinkering and soldering of the late dynasty? will not they, too, dare to *regulate* religious liberty, which, if they hazard, will probably again prove their ruin? Nations, like individuals, learn little by the experience of others; and it is sad to reflect on the mischiefs which for a long time to come may ensue for lack of practically regarding the caution, to leave to God the things which are his alone. The unbidden hand stretched forth to steady his ark will be palsied.

This volume of Mr. Noel is preeminently a book for Englishmen; though, more from its celebrity abroad than for any relevancy to practical questions likely to be agitated again here, it has, in the reprint, reached a third edition so soon after being made accessible to American readers. Even here, its perusal will do good, for it will awaken a livelier sympathy with the efforts which we feel assured will be unintermitting, and finally effectual to extirpate this gangrene from the British Constitution. Those of our countrymen whose attention had not before been specially called to this subject, will find the author's truthful delineation in the second part of his Essay, of the effects of the union both upon persons and things, more deeply fraught with manifold evils than they could have been prepared to anticipate. How its Upas shade blights the piety and mars the influence of ministers; and how deteriorating it is in various ways on the membership, both of the establishment and the dissenting churches, is but too faithfully chronicled to allow its perusal to be an inefficient dissuasive to any candid mind.

Our more intelligent English brethren are divided in their opinion of the probable extent of its immediate influence.

The more sanguine and enthusiastic predict for this work, especially at this eventful crisis of affairs among the nations of Europe, a wide and prompt effect in removing the evil which it so ably develops. On the other hand, the more phlegmatic and considerate, who fully appreciate the immense combination of interlaced and far-reaching interests, habits, prejudices, which sustain the colossal power of the church establishment, speak doubtfully and sadly of the prospects of any early triumph of right and truth. God speed the day when this monstrous wrong and falsity shall no longer injure or vex its opponents and its abettors.

ARTICLE II.

EARLY LAWS AND PROCEEDINGS IN THE MASSACHUSETTS COLONY.

Leaves from MARGARET SMITH'S Journal, in the Province of Massachusetts Bay, 1678-9.

WHEN Margaret Smith, young, pretty, and pious, parted with her "kind cousin Oliver" at Hilton Grange, in February, (1677-8,) she promised him, "that, on coming to this new countrie," she would, "for his sake and perusal, keep a little journal of whatsoever did happen both unto" herself, "and unto those with whom" she "might sojourn."

In May, 1678, after an uncomfortable voyage, which she calls "a very long, dismal time of sickness and great discomforts," she and her brother Leonard arrive in Boston, and being safely housed at "uncle and aunt Rawson's," the gentle Margaret remembers her promise to her "old play-fellow at hide and seek," who "used to hunt after flowers" for her "in the spring," and "who did fill" her "apron with hazel nuts in the autumn, (and who, we may add, after her return to England, made her his wife at the Grange,) and on "May ye 8th," begins the journal; and a most delightful journal it is, and if "cousin Oliver" was not heartily pleased with it, he has none of our sympathy whatsoever.

After a short visit in the city residence of uncle, "the Secretary of the Massachusetts," whose daughter Rebecca,

a "very tall and lady-looking" girl, of Margaret's own age, full of life, and wit, and good temper, introduces her to "much goodlie company," especially "the young men of family and distinction in the Province," and after being "courteously entertained by many of the principal people," among whom was an "aged magistrate of high esteem in those parts," who greatly "abashes and flusters" her by criticising her "lace ruff and wide sleeves," Margaret, with brother Leonard, cousin Rebecca, and others, on horseback, journeys to Newbury, where uncle Rawson has a fine house and plantation. The journey occupies three days. The first night found them at "Linne," where "the supper of warm Indian bread and sweet milk relished quite as well as any" she "ever ate in the old countrie." The next day carried them to Wenham. On the third, they visit an Indian camp at Agawam, much to Rebecca's disgust, who thought the savages "a dirty, foul people." But Margaret forgets all save that they are human, like herself, and gains their heart directly by tasting their "bread made of corn meal, unleavened, so hard one could scarcely bite it," and by making them a trifling present. At Newbury, she visits uncle Rawson's sick neighbors, and becomes acquainted with Peggy Brewster, a pretty quaker girl, who interrupts and disturbs parson Richardson in mid-sermon, and is fined for her misconduct, but says that she "did feel a relief now that she had found strength for obedience," though "it had been a sorrowful cross to her." She also visits a "haunted house," and is greatly excited by stories about witchcraft. In August, she goes to Agamenticus (Maine), and studies "many things pertaining to housekeeping," with her rustic cousins, "Polly and Thankful;" with whom she climbs hills, and attends a husking-frolic in uncle Smith's barn. Returning to Newbury and Boston in the fall, she goes to an ordination at Reading, where one of the attending deacons drinks too much flip. In the spring she visits "the Narragansett countrie," near Providence, where Leonard, having married Peggy Brewster, has taken a plantation. In June, she embarks at Boston, and her journal closes with the announcement, "to-morrow we embark for home."

The journal, therefore, covers little more than a year in time, but describes scenes, persons, and adventures in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. Its pictures of external

nature are sketched and colored with artistic power; its portraitures of human character are exceedingly lifelike, and the course of the narrative is at once truthful and interesting. Some of the faults and some of the foibles of the time, the intolerant and meddlesome spirit of the clergy, the belief in witchcraft, the hatred of Quakers, the prejudice against lace and long hair; the curse of slavery, the practice of dram-drinking at funerals and ordinations, the abuse of Indians, &c. &c. are delineated so forcibly as to have vexed those who would have us believe that "they of old times" were not only good, but faultless, and who wince under the application of the lash to anything puritanical. But we are not of those who would, in their admiration of the eloquence of Cicero, believe the wart on his nose to be beautiful; or who, in blind admiration of the stern piety of our fathers, would consecrate their vices or their infirmities.

Margaret's journal is historically just and true, whether it was written by J. G. Whittier, the Quaker poet, in 1848, or by an English Episcopalian girl in 1678.

Her adventures with the "aged magistrate of high esteem and influence," whose "quiet, sickly-looking" wife seemed "not a little in awe of her husband," and who had "a very impatient, forbidding way with him," is a capital illustration of the sumptuary folly of the olden time.

"He saluted me courteously," says Margaret, (p. 4,) "and made inquiries concerning our Familie, and *whether I had been admitted into the church.* On my telling him that I had not, he knit his Brows, and looked at me very sternly."

"'Mr. Rawson,' said he, 'your niece, I fear me, has much more need of spiritual adorning than of such gewgaws as these,' and he took hold of my *lace Ruff* so hard that I heard the Stitches break; and then he pulled out my *Sleeves*, to see how wide they were, though they were only *half an Ell.*'"

The same might be said of the "surlie," rum-selling "Deacon Dole," (p. 51,) who, on being told, by Margaret, that "it was wrong to hold any man, even an Indian or Guinea black, as a slave," replied that "I was a forward one; that he had noted that I did wear a light and idle look in the meeting-house; and pointing with his Cane to my Hair, said I did render myself liable to presentment to the Grand Jury for a breach of the statute of the General Court,

made the year before, against the immodest laying out of the Hair," &c.

Another incident (p. 211,) of the like kind may be cited in this connection, — where Mr. Wigglesworth, speaking of the "gay apparel of the young women of Boston," told Margaret and Rebecca that "the special sin of Women is Pride and Haughtiness, and that because they be generally more ignorant, being the weaker vessel; and this sin venteth itself in their gesture, (*vesture*?) their haire, and apparel." At which saying, Rebecca Rawson did, as a modern girl in like case might do, "rogueishly pinched my arm, saying apart, that after all, we weaker Vessels did seem to be of great consequence, and nobody could tell but that our head dresses would yet prove the ruin of the country!"

In a community where no person but a church member could, in the early days of the colony, (and as late as 1665,*) be admitted to vote or to hold office; where not to be a church member was not to belong to the body politic; where excommunication was disfranchisement, and to remain excommunicated was to be guilty of a crime,† — Margaret would, of course, incur the censure of surly old magistrates, by confessing that she had not joined the church.

And a whole platoon of sumptuary enactments against the finery of both males and females, might be drawn up by the curious student of colonial law. The zeal of our Puritan Fathers has certainly left some curious records on our statute books, and legislative journals. ‡

× "The statute of 1681 imposed a fine on every one 'who shall be found observing any such day as Christmas, or the like, either by forbearing labor, feasting, or any other way.'"

A similar proscription of Christmas festivities in England, according to Macaulay, was amongst the most unpopular of the puritanical regulations. He says: —

"Perhaps no single circumstance more strongly illustrates the tem-

* See Ancient Charters and Laws of Massachusetts, p. 117, c. xlix. § 4.

† I. Hutchinson, 373.

‡ Our correspondent has here furnished us with some amusing specimens, but our limits forbid their insertion. Those who would study these Legislative "Caricatures of New England Puritanism," on the "wearing of laces," "wide sleeves," "long hair and curls," "knotts of ribbon, broad shoulder bands, double ruffs and cuffs," and on the regulation of families, and of meats and drinks, are referred to Gov. Winthrop's Journal, Hutchinson's History, and Life of Cotton Mather, Sparks's Am. Biog., Vol. 6.—ED.

per of the precisians than their conduct respecting Christmas day. Christmas had been, from time immemorial, the season of joy and domestic affection, the season when families assembled, when children came home from school, when quarrels were made up, when carols were heard in every street, when every house was decorated with evergreens, and every table was loaded with good cheer. At that season, all hearts not utterly destitute of kindness, were enlarged and softened. At that season, the poor were admitted to partake largely of the overflowings of the wealth of the rich, whose bounty was peculiarly acceptable on account of the shortness of the days and the severity of the weather. At that season, the interval between landlord and tenant, master and servant, was less marked than through the rest of the year. Where there is much enjoyment there will be some excess; yet on the whole, the spirit in which the holiday was kept was not unworthy of a Christian festival. The Long Parliament gave orders, in 1644, that the twenty-fifth day of December should be strictly observed as a fast, and that all men should pass it in humbly bemoaning the great national sin which they and their fathers had so often committed on that day, by romping under the misletoe, eating boar's head, and drinking ale flavored with roasted apples. No public act of that time seems to have irritated the common people more. On the next anniversary of the festival, formidable riots broke out in many places. The constables were resisted, the magistrates insulted, the houses of noted zealots attacked, and the proscribed service of the day openly read in the churches."—Vol. i. ch. 1.

But we pass to matters of graver moment. The existence of slavery in Massachusetts, in various forms, attracted the attention of Margaret Smith. She found African slaves, Indian slaves, and white slaves,—and she found that even clergymen defended the practice of slaveholding. Under date of "August ye 1st," she says:—

"Capt. Sewall, who lives mostlie at Boston, says that a small Vessel loaded with Negroes, taken on the Madagascar coast, came last week into the Harbor, and that the owner thereof had offered the Negroes for sale as Slaves, and that they had all been sold to Magistrates, Ministers, and other people of distinction, in Boston and thereabouts. He said the Negroes were principally Women and Children, and scarce alive, by reason of their long Voyage and hard Fare. He thought it a great scandal to the Colony, and a reproach to the Church, that they should be openlie trafficked, like Cattell in the market. Uncle Rawson said it was not so formerlie; for he did remember the case of Capt. Smith and one Kesar, who brought Negroes from Guinea thirty Years ago. The General Court, urged thereto by Sir Richard Saltonstall and manie of the Ministers, passed an order that, for the purpose of 'bearing a witness against the heinous sin of Man-stealing, justlie abhorred of all good and just men,' the Negroes should be taken back to their own Countrie at the charge of the Colony; which was soon after done. Moreover, the two Men, Smith and Kesar, were duly punished.

"Mr. Richardson said he did make a distinction between the stealing of Men from a Nation at Peace with us, and the taking of Captives in Warre. The Scriptures did plainlie warrant the holding of such, and especially if they be Heathen.

"Capt. Sewall said he did, for himself, look upon all slaveholding as contrarie to the Gospel and the Newe Dispensation. The Israelites had a special Warrant for holding the Heathen in servitude; but he had never heard any one pretend that he had that authoritie for enslaving Indians and Blackamoors.

"Hereupon, Mr. Richardson asked him if he did not regard *Dea. Dole as a godlie Man*; and if he had aught to say against him and other pious Men who held Slaves. And he cautioned him to be careful, lest he should be counted an *Accuser of the Brethren*."

Rebecca Rawson is represented as liberating Effie, a Scotch girl "whom her father had bought, about a year before, of the master of a Scotch vessel." The passage is worthy of quotation.

"After the companie had gone, Rebecca sat silent and thoughtful for a time, and then bade her young serving girl, whom her Father had bought, about a year before, of the Master of a Scotch vessel, and who had been sold to pay the cost of her Passage, to come to her. She asked her if she had aught to complain of in her situation. The poor girl looked surprised, but said she had not. 'Are you content to live as a servant?' asked Rebecca. 'Would you leave me if you could?' She here fell a weeping, begging her Mistress not to speak of her leaving. 'But if I should tell you that you are free to go or stay, as you will, would you be glad or sorry?' queried her Mistress. The poor girl was silent. 'I do not wish you to leave me, Effie,' said Rebecca, 'but I wish you to know that you are from henceforth free, and that if you serve me hereafter, as I trust you will, it will be in Love and good will, and for suitable Wages.' The bondswoman did not at the first comprehend the design of her Mistress, but, on hearing it explained once more, she dropped down on her knees, and clasping Rebecca, poured forth her Thanks after the manner of her People; whereupon Rebecca, greatly moved, bade her rise, as she had only done what the Scriptures did require in *giving to her servant that which is just and equal*.

"'How easy it is to make others happie, and ourselves also!' she said, turning to me with the Tears shining in her Eyes."

The slave market in all the colonies was supplied with Europeans, both male and female, who had been kidnapped and sent across the Atlantic. The historian Macaulay, (i. c. 3,) says:—

"There was, in the Trans-Atlantic possessions of the crown, a great demand for labor; and this demand was partly supplied by a system of crimping and kidnapping at the principal English seaports. Nowhere was this system found in such active and extensive operation as

at Bristol. Even the first magistrates of that city were not ashamed to enrich themselves by so odious a commerce."

There were also white slaves, made such by colonial laws. In 1638, two persons convicted of stealing, were sentenced "to be delivered into slavery." In 1640, for accidentally "firing the barn of his master," one Stevens was sentenced to twenty-one years of servitude.* The persons of poor debtors, if the creditor so desired, might be sold into bondage until the debt was cancelled; the purchaser, however, must be English and not Indian.

The Indian slaves were either captives taken in war, or purchases made from other colonies. But the North American savage submitted very impatiently to bondage. He was always surly, disobedient, and dangerous, or sullen and inactive. The act of 1712, prohibiting the importation of Indian slaves, recites, in its preamble, that "divers conspiracies, barbarities, murders, burglaries, thefts, and other notorious crimes and enormities," had been committed by such slaves, and that they were "of a malicious, surly, and revengeful spirit, rude and insolent in their behavior, and very ungovernable."

African slaves were to be found in the colony from the very beginning. When Gov. Winthrop and the charter came over, in 1630, Mr. Mavaracke, who was then living on Noddle's Island (East Boston), was the owner of several colored slaves.

Man-stealing, however, was, by an early statute, declared to be a capital offence, and the laws provided, that no slaves should be allowed, except such as were taken captive in war.

In 1645, two negroes having been brought from Africa by Thomas Keyser, *mate*, and James Smith, *captain*, who had been to Guinea to trade for negroes, the magistrates "took order to have these two negroes set at liberty and to be sent home." Smith was a member of the church at Boston. Upon the petition of Richard Saltonstall, one of the assistants, "for justice to be done on Capt. Smith and Mr. Keyser for their injurious dealing with the negroes at Guinea, the petition was granted, and it was ordered that Capt. Smith and Mr. Keyser be laid hold on and committed to give answer in convenient time thereabouts." †

* Col. Rec. Vol. i. † Col. Rec. iii. 45.
VOL. XIV.—NO LVI. 30

But this early spirit of humanity died out, and slavery became universal. The Mathers (Increase and Cotton,) thought it no shame to hold slaves. Cotton Mather, in recapitulating what he calls "the retaliating dispensations of heaven towards him," says, "I can tell that the Lord has most notably, in many instances, retaliated my dutifulness to my father." As one example, he states that he once bought a Spanish Indian servant and bestowed him on his father: and some years after, a knight, whom he had laid under obligations, bestowed a Spanish Indian servant upon him.*

This pious recorder of "retaliating dispensations" is "the pert, talkative lad" whom Margaret Smith noticed at the ordination "among those who sat at the second table," (p. 144-5,) and who, even then, at the age of sixteen, was entertaining his companions with instances of like "retaliation."

Our amiable friend Margaret, who, in her notions on slavery, seems somewhat in advance of her times, appears to have shared a little in the prevalent belief in witchcraft. Soon after her arrival she is informed that there is "an house in Newbury dolefully beset by Satan's imps;" at Agamenticus she hears of "a famous Doctor of Physic, and, as it seems, a great wizard also;" Goodwoman Weare tells her of "manie marvellous and truly unaccountable things, so that I must needs think there is an invisible hand at work there;" she goes to "the haunted house," and hears and sees divers wonders. At another time she went to see "a young girl said to be possessed," and although she says "I did see nothing in her behaviour beyond that of a vicious and spoiled child," yet, she adds, "there was much talk on this matter, which so disturbed my fancy that I slept but poorly."

On her return from Agamenticus, she met with an adventure that may be quoted as a very good specimen of witchcraft in haunted houses.

"We went up the River to Strawberry Bank, where we tarried over night. The Woman who entertained us had lost her Husband in the

* One of the subjects mentioned in Cotton Mather's Diary, is Slavery. He says, that in the year 1706, he received a singular blessing; some gentlemen of his society, having heard accidentally that he was much in want of a good servant, had the generosity to purchase for him "a very likely slave." Such a present, he says, was "a mighty smile of heaven upon his family. — *Sparks's Am. Biog.* vi. 182, 305.

Warre, and having to see to the ordering of matters out of Doors in this busie season of Harvest, it was no marvel that she did neglect those within. I made a comfortable supper of baked Pumpkin and Milk, and for lodgings I had a straw Bed on the Floor, in the dark Loft, which was piled well nigh full with Corne ears, Pumpkins, and Beanes, besides a great deal of old household trumperie, Wool, and Flax, and the Skins of Animals. Although tired of my Journey, it was some little time before I could get asleep; and it soe fell out, that after the Folks of the house were all abed, and still, it being, as I judge, nigh midnight, I chanced to touch with my foot a Pumpkin lying near the Bedd, which set it a rolling down the Stairs, bumping hard on every Stair as it went. Thereupon I heard a great stir below, the Woman and her three Daughters crying out that the house was haunted. Presentlie she called to me from the foot of the Stairs, and asked me if I did hear any thing. I laughed soe at all this, that it was some time before I could speak; when I told her I did hear a thumping on the Stairs. 'Did it seem to go up, or down?' inquired she, anxiouslie; and on my telling her that the Sound went downward, she set up a sad Crie, and they all came fleeing into the Corn-loft, the Girls bouncing upon my Bedd, and hiding under the Blanket, and the old Woman praying and groaning, and saying that she did believe it was the Spirit of her poor Husband. By this time my Uncle, who was lying on the Settle in the Room below, hearing the Noise, got up, and stumbling over the Pumpkin, called to know what was the matter. Thereupon the Woman bade him flee up Stairs, for there was a Ghost in the Kitchen. 'Pshaw!' said my Uncle, 'is that all? I thought to be sure the Indians had come.' As soon as I could speak for laughing, I told the poor Creature what it was that so frightened her; at which she was greatlie vexed; and after she went to Bedd again, I could hear her scolding me for playing Tricks upon honest people."

It was not until many years after Margaret's return to England that the "witchcraft excitement and delusion" came to its crisis in New England, although human sacrifices had already been offered upon the altar of this superstition.

Even Mrs. Hutchinson had been suspected of witchcraft; "for it was certainly known," says Winthrop, (ii. 9,) "that Hawkins's wife (who continued with her, and was her bosom friend,) had much familiarity with the devil in England, when she dwelt at St. Ives, where divers ministers and others resorted to her and found it true!"

In 1646, occurred at Hartford, in Connecticut, the first instance of hanging for witchcraft.

The first person who suffered death for this offence in Massachusetts was Margaret Jones, of Charlestown, in 1648. Gov. Winthrop, (vol. ii. 326,) with the greatest sang-froid, concludes his narrative of her case with these words: — "The same day and hour she was executed, there was a very great

tempest at Connecticut, which blew down many trees," &c. In 1651, the General Court ordered a public and solemn fast, "because of the extent to which Satan prevails amongst us, in respect to witchcraft."

In 1655, Mrs. Hibbins, the widow of one of the councilors, was convicted and hanged in Boston, as a witch. After her execution, the appetite for blood seems to have abated, and the public feeling on the subject of witchcraft remained very much as described by Margaret Smith, until Cotton Mather, in 1685, published his "Memorable Providences relating to Witchcraft," and thus kindled anew the fires of hell in thousands of superstitious bosoms.

Our shame and disgust, as we read the story of the Salem Witchcraft, are mitigated by the recollection that throughout christendom, all men, learned and ignorant, wise and foolish, were earnest believers in the reality of diabolical possession, and that everywhere else, as well as in Massachusetts, death was inflicted upon all who were convicted of having entered into compact with Satan. The general disgrace of the whole human family does not disturb us so much as the disgrace of our own particular colony or province; patriotism is but one small district in the wide world of philanthropy.

The Journal of Margaret Smith is full of the persecutions and sufferings of Quakers. It presents a gallery of pictures, in each of which the intolerant spirit of our fathers, and the wrongs which were done to the disciples of George Fox, are forcibly delineated, and held up to modern regret and mortification.

Our puritan ancestors were not more bigoted, intolerant, or inclined to persecution, than other religious communities have been in various ages of the world. In their stern statutes against Baptists, Jesuits, Quakers, &c., they only followed after countless examples of kindred legislation. In their bitter denunciations against heresy, they only echoed the voices of forty preceding generations. In their cruel enforcement of cruel laws, they verily supposed, like all other persecutors, that they were doing God service.

Why then do their posterity, almost without exception, admit that for their persecuting spirit they deserve severer condemnation than the Pagans of the early centuries and the Papists of later ages? Is it not because we feel that they ought to have learned forbearance and toleration from what

they had themselves suffered for conscience' sake? Is it not because we feel that men who had seen how impotent is the civil power in its endeavors to enforce conformity to established religious creeds and modes of worship; men who had learned to love a free conscience better than home and friends, and civilization and native land; men who had fled from the old world to the new to enjoy religious freedom, ought to have understood and practised the great doctrine of "soul-liberty" as clearly and as certainly as they beheld and enjoyed the free light or breathed the free air of heaven?

In all ordinary cases we expect that persecution will beget persecution. "Violence naturally engenders violence." The recollection of injuries suffered stimulates the spirit of revenge, and wrong begets wrong, in accordance with a uniform law of unregenerated hearts. But in pious hearts, — in the breasts of the Christian disciples, — in a commonwealth of God's elect, we shudder to behold the workings of this satanic leaven of unrighteousness, and blush to remember that the Massachusetts Colony could not rise above the example of Saul of Tarsus, Diocletian of Rome, Spanish Inquisitors, this "bloody Mary," and the "Lords Bishops" of England. We cannot forget that at the very time, and after the time, when Roger Williams was preaching the great gospel of unfettered conscience; at the time, and after the time, when three of the American Colonies had founded their governments upon the corner-stone of "soul-liberty," — at the time, and after the time, when the Baptist Williams, in Rhode Island, and the Quaker Penn, in Pennsylvania, and the Catholic Lord Baltimore, in Maryland, had set the example of both civil and religious freedom, puritanical Massachusetts persisted long, obstinately, blindly, in the foolish and wicked endeavor to model men into orthodoxy by legislative enactments, and convert them to truth by fine and imprisonment, whipping and mutilation, banishment and death.

In considering this chapter of Massachusetts history, it is folly to inquire whether our forefathers acted in conformity with their charter, and had a right to enact whatever law they pleased of bigotry and persecution. We see it gravely asserted (we will not say *argued*, for that would be an abuse of language,) in some recent publications, that the early settlers of Massachusetts had a perfect right to determine for themselves what religion and religious opinions should be

should not be allowed a dwelling place within their territorial limits.* So have the present people of Massachusetts as perfect a right to change their Constitution, and reenact the old colonial statutes of intolerance. Doubtless there are bigots to-day who would conscientiously glory in such a retrograde revolution, and rejoice once more, for the love of God, to inflict stripes upon the contumacious shoulders of modern heretics.

The great question of religious freedom is above the level of charters and constitutions, and in our days, no intelligent and candid man will believe or affirm that either law, charter, or constitution, can be so framed as to justify persecution or intolerance. The bloodiest persecutions which ever outraged humanity, were strictly according to law: yet who will defend the persecutors before the High Chancery of Humanity and of Heaven, by pleading the law in justification of their severity.

When, in 1629, Gov. Endicot seized and sent home to England, Messrs. John and Samuel Brown, "the one a lawyer, the other a merchant, both of them amongst the number of the first patentees, men of estates, and men of parts and post in the place," because they followed the forms of the church of England, and used the book of Common Prayer in their devotions, and worshipped "in a place distinct from the public assembly," † all reasonable men feel that he was guilty of an outrage on justice, whatever might be his legal authority. And when we recollect that for this outrage he passed uncensured, although a few years later he was temporarily disfranchised for cutting the cross from the British flag, we cannot admire the discriminating justice of that generation. ‡

When the General Court of 1631 enacted that "none should be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as were church members," § their conduct was unjust, illiberal and dishonorable, even though it were legal. "This law at once divested every person who did not hold the prevailing opinions, not only on the fundamental points of Christian doctrine, but with respect to ecclesiastical discipline, and the ceremonies of worship, of all the privileges of a citizen. An uncontrolled power of approving or rejecting the claims of

* See Boston Recorder, March 16, 23, A. D. 1849.

† Morton's Memorial, p. 147. Young's Annals of Mass. 287.

‡ Grahame, i. 167. § Hutchinson.

those who applied for admission into communion with the Church being vested in the ministers and elders of each congregation, the most valuable civil rights were made to depend on their decision with respect to qualifications purely ecclesiastical." (*Grahame* i. 164.)

When about the year 1632 "a complaint of arbitrary and illegal measures was preferred against the colonists by a Roman Catholic who had been banished from the colony,"* whatever King Charles may have thought of their conduct, we are constrained to condemn it.

The statutes against Jesuits belong to the same chapter of legalized intolerance. They allowed no Jesuit or spiritual or ecclesiastical person ordained by the authority of the Pope or See of Rome to come into the colony. Any person within the colony who was suspected of being "one of such society or order," might be dragged before a magistrate, and obliged to "free himself of such suspicion," on penalty of being committed to prison or bound over to the next Court, "to be tried and proceeded with, by banishment, or otherwise, as the Court shall see cause." Any person so banished, if taken a second time within the colony, was, on conviction, sentenced to death. (*Act of 1647, Col. Laws, c. 54, p. 129.*)

Can any law justify the brutality of fining a man £40, whipping him, cutting off his ears, and banishing him for "speaking ill of a church," as our fathers served Ratcliffe in 1631? X

Is the civil law any just excuse for inflicting a fine, as in the case of Mr. Matthews, in 1650, for "preaching to an unauthorised church?"

Suppose that our laws now allowed the magistrate to banish a citizen who, like Hugh Bewett in 1640, should publicly hold and maintain that "he was free from original sin, and from actual [sin] also, for half a year before, and that all true Christians are enabled to live without committing actual sin," — would we banish him? (*Winth. ii. 19.*) X

The banishment of Roger Williams, of Mrs. Hutchinson, Mr. Wheelwright, and scores of others at various times, "for opinion's sake," illustrates the working of that old leaven of intolerance which kept the colony in constant ferment during nearly half a century.

* *Grahame*, i. 162.

We have neither time nor inclination to enter into details concerning these early persecutions, but let us recall a fact or two to memory.*

The citizens of Boston, who regarded as unjust the treatment bestowed on Wheelwright by the General Court, sent a petition to that body, containing the expression of their views and feelings. Thereupon it was resolved by the Court that their next session should be holden at Newtown (Cambridge), instead of Boston: and it was so held accordingly, — and as many emigrants were expected from England whose opinions coincided with those of Wheelwright and the Bostonians, a most extraordinary act was passed for the purpose of preventing the settlement of such new comers. "A penalty was laid on all persons who should entertain in their houses any stranger who came with intent to reside, or should allow the use of any lot or habitation, above three weeks, without liberty from one of the standing Council, or two other assistants. The penalty on private persons was £40, and twenty pounds besides for every month they continued in the offence. And any town which gave or sold a lot to such stranger was subject to £100 penalty; but if any inhabitant of such town should enter his dissent with a magistrate, he was to be excused his part of the fine." (*Hutchinson, c. i.*) Not content with this monstrous act of tyranny, they proceeded to punish the petitioners, and expelled two of their own members, one for signing the petition, the other for justifying it. (*ib.*)

They also required about sixty citizens of Boston to deliver up their arms and ammunition under penalty of a heavy fine; and at the same time passed a law to punish by fine, imprisonment or banishment, any person who should "defame any court or any of their sentences."

Hutchinson informs us that "a great number removed out of the jurisdiction, some of them being banished, some disfranchised." He adds, "It is evident that inquisition was made into men's private judgments, as well as into their declarations and practice.† He might have added that there never

* In regard to the banishment of Williams we gladly refer our readers to the very learned articles recently published in the *Christian Watchman and Reflector*, and which, from intrinsic evidence, as well as the initials subscribed, we attribute to our learned and candid Congregational friend, Zachariah Eddy, Esq., of Middleboro'.

† Mr. Dudley died with a copy of verses in his pocket, written with his own hand. The following two lines made part of it: —

"Let men of God in courts and churches watch,
O'er such as doe a toleration hatch!" (*Hutch.*)

"During the administration of Cromwell, a Presbyterian minister, who had

was exhibited a more wanton abuse of power, or a more disgraceful spectacle of intolerance. The intolerant spirit shows itself in almost every page of the legislation and history of that age. Even the domestic education of children was subjected to legal rules of like character. Every parent was commanded to teach his family some "orthodox catechism." (Act 1642.)

So also every school master was required to be "sound in the faith," and to "give satisfaction according to the rules of Christ," and the selectmen (who must be church members) were to judge of his qualifications. (*Col. Laws*, p. 186.) Grammar school masters must be approved by the minister of the town and the ministers of the two next adjacent towns, or any two of them. (*ib.* 372.)

In the Pequod war, the very soldiers were required to be orthodox in faith. "The Massachusetts militia, previously to their march, exerted no small diligence in purging their ranks of all persons whose religious sentiments did not fully correspond with the general standard of faith and orthodoxy." (*Grahame*, i. 175.)

In 1644, the spirit of intolerance was specially directed against the Baptists, and found expression in the statute of Nov. 13th, 1644.* The preamble to this act stigmatizes the Anabaptists as "incendiaries of commonwealths," "infectors of persons in main matters of religion" and "troublers of churches." It asserts that they who have held infant baptism unlawful, have usually held other heresies also, concealing the same until "they spied out a fit advantage and opportunity to vent them, by way of question or scruple." The statute then orders that all persons shall be banished who shall "either openly condemn or oppose the baptising of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof; or who shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, or shall deny

himself felt the rod of persecution, published a treatise against what he was pleased to term "this cursed intolerable toleration." — *Orme's Life of Owen*. In a work published in 1645 a New England minister thus expresses himself: "It is said that men ought to have liberty of conscience, and that it is persecution to debar them of it. I can rather stand amazed than reply to this. It is an astonishment that the brains of men should be parboiled in such impious ignorance." — *Belknap's N. H.*, as quoted by *Grahame*, i. 159.

* Winthrop (ii. 174,) informs us that "Anabaptistry increased and spread in the country, which occasioned the magistrates to" enact the law of 1644. Yet Bancroft (i. 432,) says "the law was not designed to be enforced," and he cites Hutch. Coll. 216. Winthrop, better than any one else, must have known for what purpose the law was designed.

the ordinance of magistracy, *or* their lawful right and authority to make war, *or* to punish the outward breaches of the first table."*

When it is remembered that the law required every person to attend public worship, and of course to witness the baptisms which were there administered, it is easy to imagine how heavily the legal yoke would press upon the baptist neck.

In 1646 was enacted a statute against every description of heresy; a statute which shows not only the spirit of intolerance, but a consciousness on the part of the General Court that they were outraging the rights of conscience. † The preamble declares that "*no human power is lord over the faith and consciences of men,*" and then adds "yet because such as bring in damnable heresies tending to the subversion of the christian faith, and destruction of the souls of men, ought duly to be restrained from such notorious impieties, it is therefore, ordered," &c., "That if *any christian* within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the *christian* faith and religion, by broaching and maintaining *any* damnable heresies, as denying the immortality of the soul, or resurrection of the body, or [qu. asserting?] any sin to be repented of in the regenerate, or any evil done by the outward man to be accounted sin, or denying that Christ gave himself a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by his death and righteousness, but by the perfections of our own works, or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment," &c., &c., "or shall endeavor to seduce others to any of the errors or heresies above mentioned — every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall be sentenced to banishment."

That these statutes were not intended as idle menaces, is proved by the fact that the hand of the persecutor had fallen

* "These nursing fathers of the Commonwealth," says the candid editor of Winthrop, "knew very well that some of the most sincere and orthodox christians, according with them even in the mint, anise and cummin of all forms, or rejection of forms, except this single one of Pædobaptism, had gathered separate churches in England; yet they level their battery of insinuations and assertions [in the preamble to the Act of 1644] against the direful delusions and execrable fanaticism of the savage reformers of Munster." "Passing from bad to worse, our rulers soon punished Quakers with death, the last extravagance to which sincere professors of our divine religion could proceed." (*Winth.* ii. 174, note, *Savage's Edition.*)

† Sir Henry Vane had already expressed his conviction to the rulers of Massachusetts, that "it were better not to censure any persons for matters of a religious concernment." (*iii. Mass. Hist. Coll.* i, 37.)

heavily on the Anabaptists in Massachusetts long before their enactment.

In 1638-9, an attempt being made to organize a Baptist church in Weymouth, the promoters of that design were arraigned (March 13, 1638-9,) before the General Court, and fined and imprisoned, or fined and banished, or otherwise punished, as the Court deemed meet. (i. *Winth.* 289. *Benedict, Bap.* 369.)

In 1643, according to Winthrop, "The Lady Moody, a wise and *anciently* religious woman, being taken with the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the church of Salem, (whereof she was a member,) but persisting still, and to avoid farther *trouble, &c.*, she removed to the Dutch, against the advice of all her friends. Many others *infected* with anabaptism, removed thither also. She was after excommunicated." (*Winth.* ii. 123-4.)

In 1644, a man named Painter, having become a Baptist, was complained of to the Court for refusing to have his child baptized. The Court ordered him to permit the baptism, and on his expressing his belief that infant baptism is an anti-christian ordinance, he was tied up and whipped; "not for his opinion," says Winthrop, "but for reproaching the Lord's ordinance, and for his bold and evil behavior both at home and in the Court!" (*ib.* 175.)

The practice of persecution continued after the passage of the statutes of 1644 and 1646. Numerous cases of the prosecution and punishment of Baptists disgraced the records of Massachusetts, and provoked the censures of pious men of all denominations in England. Our readers will find enough on this subject in the histories of Backus and Benedict to wring their hearts, if not to kindle their indignation, — to awaken their pity, if not to rouse their scorn and contempt.

Hutchinson is mistaken in supposing that the year 1665 was the date of the first persecution of the Baptists. In 1651, Messrs. John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and Crandall were arrested, prosecuted and convicted under the statutes of '44 and '46. Their offence was attempting to preach at Lynn. They were arrested and forced by the constable to attend the Congregational service, where, "expressing their aversion by a harmless indecorum," (putting on their hats,) "which would yet have been without excuse, had their presence been

voluntary," they still further provoked the ill will of their persecutors. They were condemned to pay a heavy fine or be whipped. "Holmes, who refused to pay his fine, was whipped unmercifully," being stripped to the skin, bound to the whipping post, and scourged with a three-corded whip, "the man, as the spectators said, striking with all his strength, (yea, spitting in his hands three times, as many affirmed,) and giving me therewith thirty strokes." *

Some of the bystanders being moved to tears as they saw the scourge cutting into his flesh and the blood flowing from his wounds, who, like the dying Stephen, was crying aloud "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," gave utterance to their pity. Warrants were issued and two of them arrested and sentenced for this heinous offence to receive ten lashes or pay a fine. The crime proved against them was, that they took Mr. Holmes by the hand as he came from the whipping post and blessed God for the strength and support which had been given him.

"These measures of intolerance and cruelty" not only enlisted the sympathies of many in favor of the sufferers, but provoked the reproof of the more sober friends of the colony. "The bigotry of personal interest," however, and "the love of unity" still led the elders and rulers of the colony into persecution.

Amongst those who regretted and condemned the conduct of the persecutors was Sir Richard Saltonstall, who was in England when the report of the misconduct of his brethren and associates reached the mother country. He wrote to Wilson and Cotton in terms of deserved reproach, informing them that but for their severity the people of Massachusetts would have been "the eyes of God's people in England." "This your practice of compelling any in matters of worship to do that whereof they are not fully persuaded," wrote he, "is to make them sin, for so the apostle (Rom. xiv. 23,) tells us; and many are made hypocrites thereby, conforming in their outward man for fear of punishment." †

The substance of Mr. Cotton's answer was in these words: "Better be hypocrites than profane persons." He had, on another occasion, exclaimed, "better tolerate hypocrites than

* Bancroft, i. 449. Benedict, 376. † See the whole letter in Backus, i.

thorns and briars."* What Wilson's reply would have been may be inferred from his assaulting Holmes and striking and cursing him in the very presence of the Court. †

In 1665, an attempt being made to organize a Baptist Church in Boston, the fires of persecution blazed out again with increased fury, and in a flame which was not extinguished for many long and wearisome years. This was what Hutchinson erroneously calls the first persecution.

We will not stir up the embers of this old fire, for we find the task too great a trial of our temper. In process of time the puritan church had reason to recall with sorrow the prophetic warnings of Sir Henry Vane, who had exhorted those of the "Congregational way" not to teach its opponents the way "to root it out."‡ "When the proceedings against the Congregationalists in England were complained of," says Hutchinson, "they were told by Dr. Stillingfleet that they were justified by the proceedings of their brethren in New England against dissenters from the established worship there."

But the sufferings of the Baptists in Massachusetts fade into insignificance when compared with those of the Quakers. Nothing seemed to satisfy the intolerant fathers of Massachusetts of the cruelty or folly of their policy. Even the declaration of the king that "the principle and foundation of the charter of Massachusetts was the freedom of liberty of conscience," did not affect their opinions or proceedings. § X
"Without the shedding of blood, there" was to be "no remission" of their persecutions. Nor would the bloody baptism of the scourge; applied in cases without number to heretic shoulders both male and female, suffice. The human sacrifice must be complete ere orthodox zeal could relax its efforts and rest content.

Two years before any Quaker appeared in the colony a very silly order was adopted by the General Court for the destruction of the books of Reeves & Muggleton. || The announcement of such a law was regarded by the Quakers as a challenge. They were ambitious of martyrdom. It was truly said of them, "that in those places where these people are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely, there they least of all desire to come. They delight to be persecuted by

* Id. Bancroft, i. 449. † Holmes's letter in Benedict (ed. 1848), 375.

‡ Bancroft, i. 448. § Hutch. Coll. 378. || Hutchinson.

civil powers, and when they are so, they are like to gain more adherents by the conseyste of their patient sufferings, than by consent to their pernicious sayings." * Where their books were feared by bigots and forbidden by unjust laws, they were sure to come, bearing their volumes with them.

In 1656, two Quaker missionaries, both females, arrived in Boston from Barbadoes. "There was, as yet, no statute against Quakers. But they were seized and thrust into prison. Their trunks were searched and their books burned. They were stripped naked and searched for marks of witchcraft, and after five weeks' confinement were thrust out of the jurisdiction. †

In a few months nine others arrived, and were welcomed in like christian manner. Their books were taken from them and they were dragged before the Court. Being interrogated (contrary to the known law of England), and their answers not satisfying the magistrates, they were cast into prison. As the Governor passed by the window of their cell, Mary Prince reviled him, (and he deserved a hundredfold bitterer reproaches,) saying, "Wo unto thee; thou art an oppressor. The judgments of God will fall upon thee!" This was that "rugged Dudley," who, "not mellowed by age," exclaimed on his death-bed, "God forbid our love for the truth should be grown so cold that we should tolerate errors. I die no libertine!" ‡ They were banished, and, by a usurpation of authority wholly without even color of law, the court required the master of the ship in which they came to become bound with sureties in the sum of £500 to carry them all away. The Quakers were committed to prison until the vessel should be ready to sail. §

After all this came the laws concerning Quakers, in which puritanical ingenuity and the vocabulary of vituperation were exhausted to furnish terms of reproach against the victims of these iniquitous proceedings. They are called "a cursed sect of hereticks," "blasphemous vagabonds" and "pestilent fellows;" and their tenets are pronounced "absurd, blasphemous, horrid, and dangerous."

Hutchinson says that at the term of the General Court

* Letter from the government of R. I. to the Mass. General Court, Oct. 13, 1657. Hutch. Hist. App. xi.

† Bancroft, i. 452.

‡ Bancroft, i. 449, 452. Hutch., c. i.

§ Hutch. c. i.

which followed the banishment of these eleven Quakers, an act was passed imposing a penalty of £100 on the master of any vessel who should bring a known Quaker into the colony; requiring him to give security to retransport such Quaker; and directing that the Quaker himself (or herself, for the law knew not the decencies or distinctions of sex) should be whipped and confined in the House of Correction at hard labor until transportation. A penalty of £5 was imposed on the introduction or circulation of Quaker books, and severe penalties for defending their opinions.

But all these laws were of no avail; and worse than that — they allured the very people whom they were framed to intimidate. "They came," as Bancroft says, "expressly because they were not welcome. Quakers swarmed where they were feared." New laws of shameful severity were vainly multiplied. For every hour's entertainment of a known Quaker, his entertainer was fined forty shillings. Any Quaker after the first conviction, if a man, was to lose one ear, and the second time the other; a woman, each time to be severely whipped; and the third time, man or woman, to have their tongues bored through with a red hot iron.* Every convert to Quakerism in the colony was subject to the like punishment. Afterwards a penalty of ten shillings was laid on every person who should attend a Quaker meeting, and £5 on every one speaking at such meeting. In October, 1658, to crown this infernal climax, it was further enacted that all Quakers returning into the colony after sentence of banishment, should be put to death. The legislature that was ashamed of its statute for mutilation, had no blush for this last stage of legal enormity.

Four individuals, one of whom was a woman, suffered death in pursuance of this statute. Multitudes of both sexes were imprisoned, and among these was one little girl of eleven years old; three at least were mutilated;† and great numbers, male and female, were whipped, some in prison, some at the whipping post, and some "at the cart's tail," and from town to town.

Conduct so brutal excited the indignation of the common people, and government was forced to guard the prison by day

* Bancroft (i. 453) says the colony was so ashamed of the order for mutilation, that it was soon repealed and never printed.

† Hutchinson — who quotes Bishop's "New England Judged."

and night to keep them off. The magistrates were horror-struck, not by their own cruelty, but by the obstinate determination of their victims. For every Quaker put to death, five others, as one prisoner told them, hastened to fill his place.

The people of England were horrified by the narrative of these barbarities, and begged the king to interfere. In September, 1661, His Majesty issued an order requiring that a stop should be put to all capital or corporal punishment of Quakers, and that such as were obnoxious should be sent to England. The order concerning punishment was obeyed. "Indeed" says Hutchinson, "before the receipt of this letter, *but probably when they were in expectation of it*, all that were in prison were discharged and sent out of the colony." Such a revision of the law was afterwards made that vagabond Quakers were liable to whipping only, and instead of being whipped from town to town until they were expelled from the colony, they were whipped through only three towns.

An extract from Margaret Smith's Journal will form an appropriate conclusion to this sketch of puritanical intolerance :

"Governor Easton, who is a pleasant talker, told a story of a Magistrate who had been a great persecutor of his people. On one occasion, after he had cast a worthy Friend into jail, he dreamed a dream in this wise : He thought he was in a faire, delightful place, where were sweet springs of Water and green Meadows, and rare Fruit-trees and Vines, with ripe Clusters thereon, and in the midst thereof flowed a River whose waters were clearer than Chrystal. Moreover, he did behold a great multitude walking on the River's bank, or sitting lovingly in the Shade of the Trees which grew thereby. Now while he stood marvelling at all this, he beheld in his dream the Man he had cast into Prison sitting with his Hat on, side by side with a Minister then dead, whom the Magistrate had held in great esteem while living ; whereat, feeling his anger stirred within him, he went straight and bade the man take off his Hat in the presence of his betters. Howbeit the twain did give no heed to his words, but did continue to talk lovingly together as before ; whereupon he waxed exceeding wroth and would have laid Hands upon the man. But, hearing a voice calling upon him to forbear, he did look about him, and behold one, with a shining countenance, and clad in Raiment so white that it did dazzle his Eyes to look upon it, stood before him. And the Shape said, 'Dost thou well to be angry ?' Then said the Magistrate, 'Yonder is a Quaker with his Hat on talking with a godly Minister.' 'Nay,' quoth the Shape, 'thou seest but after the Manner of the World and with the Eyes of Flesh. Look yonder, and tell me what thou seest.' So he looked again, and lo, two men in shining Raiment, like him who talked with him, sat under the tree. 'Tell me,' said the Shape, 'if thou canst, which of the twain is the Quaker and which is the Priest.' And when he could not, but stood in amazement confessing he did see neither of them, the

Shape said, 'Thou sayest well, for here be neither Priest nor Quaker, Jew nor Gentile, but all are one in the Lord.' Then he awoke, and pondered long upon his dream, and when it was morning he went straightway to the Jail and ordered the man to be set free, and hath ever since carried himself lovingly towards the Quakers."

ARTICLE III.

▼ SHALL THE DEATH PENALTY BE ABOLISHED?

THE question which we have proposed for discussion is one of much importance, and of deep and thrilling interest. The public mind has for a long time been agitated upon it, and recent events have not served to allay this agitation. There is a large class in the community who seem determined to secure the abolishment of the death penalty by every means in their power. We do not object to the use of any and all *proper* means for this purpose; but we think it is never safe or wise to appeal to the worst passions of human nature in support of any cause, however deserving. We have no fears for the truth, so long as it is combated with reason and candor, nor have we any fears respecting the final issue, let it be attacked in any manner. It is our purpose to consider the question before us in a candid and unbiased spirit, and to arrive at such conclusions as are warranted by the most sober judgment. How far we are able to do so, we shall leave our readers to judge.

Those who plead for the abolition of the death penalty, argue that society has no right to take the life which it cannot give. They contend that all the rights which society has over the individual, are those which he has voluntarily surrendered to it by becoming a member of the social compact. And since the individual has no right to take his own life, he cannot yield any such right to society. In reply to this argument, it may be affirmed, that it is not so perfectly clear that an individual may not jeopardize his own life for sufficient reasons. We have been accustomed to feel a high veneration for those who have been willing to sacrifice their lives in defence of the truth, and who have taken the martyr's crown. We believe there are cases in which it would be de-

cidedly wrong for a man to preserve his *life* even, at the sacrifice of principle. The example of our Saviour and of the primitive christians, as well as the teachings of the New Testament warrant us in coming to this conclusion. For good and sufficient reasons, then, a man has a right to yield up his own life, and he may give up that right to society when a paramount good requires it. But the argument proves too much. I have no more right to shut myself up in prison, or to inflict upon myself any other kind of needless suffering, than I have to take my life; therefore I cannot grant to society any such right over me. And hence all punishments inflicted by society must be wrong. Such is the legitimate result to which we are led by adopting the principle in question. The truth is, society, from the very nature of its constitution, has a right over the individual to any extent which the general good may demand.

It is argued again, that capital punishment has not prevented murder, and hence that it is ineffectual to restrain it. The same argument might be urged with equal force against the infliction of any penalty for any offence. Our laws sentence the convicted thief to the penitentiary for a term of years according to the magnitude of his offence; but has the infliction of this penalty prevented stealing? The unlicensed retailer of ardent spirits, on conviction, is condemned to pay a fine; but does this prevent the illegal traffic?

Legislators do not expect that any penalties, however justly and faithfully executed, will prevent crime altogether. They expect that they will exert a restraining influence upon vicious men, so that society will be measurably protected. They are warranted in believing that there are some men so abandoned that the fear of no punishment will deter them from violating just laws. The only proper question to ask, therefore, in respect to any penalty, after its justice has been determined, is, Will it be *most likely* to restrain men from the commission of the crime? That such is the belief of the majority of men in respect to capital punishment is sufficiently manifest in the fact, that it is deemed necessary by nearly all governments in the world. Nor are there wanting other facts to confirm this opinion. One or two must suffice our purpose. It is asserted that Coolidge, previous to the murder of Matthews, made very particular inquiries of the Attorney of the State as to the probability that the penalty of death would be in-

flicted upon a murderer, in the then existing state of public sentiment. The answer which he received from that officer was such as no doubt strengthened him in his foul purpose. It is stated upon reliable authority, that when the present Governor of Cuba arrived in that island, the law of capital punishment for murder had been for years a dead letter upon the statute book. No one attempted to execute it. And what was the result? The crime of murder was unrebuked and unrestrained. No man's life was safe. Murders were daily committed, and no more was thought of finding a dead man upon the sidewalks in the morning, the victim of some murderous assassin, than we think of finding a dead dog in *our* streets. Though opposed and threatened, that magistrate determined to enforce the law, firmly and rigidly, and the result is that now human life is comparatively safe there. Such facts are of more weight than volumes of mere theoretical speculations.

It is also argued that capital punishment has never been sure or equal. Juries, it is said, are extremely unwilling to convict of a capital offence. This may be all granted; indeed, it may be true to the full extent claimed; but it is difficult to see how it can be regarded as an argument against the death penalty. If the law is a good one, and men are unwilling to execute it, there is greater reason why its friends should rally to its support. And is there not reason to believe that this state of feeling in the minds of men has been produced, not by looking at the merits of the case, nor by yielding to the dictates of an enlightened understanding, but by appeals which have been made to their sympathies, and by the threats of odium and disgrace with which certain individuals have declared they will follow them? There is a vast deal of public sentiment in our day, which is manufactured for the occasion. Let juries be enlightened upon this subject, and taught to observe the solemnities of their oath, rather than the taunts and jeers of those who unblushingly array themselves against all wholesome restraints, and sure conviction will follow from clear and unequivocal proofs of guilt.

And it may with as much propriety be urged against the execution of all laws, that they are unequal, as against this. Inequality grows out of man's necessarily limited and imperfect capacities. Every crime which is committed cannot be traced, by perfectly clear and demonstrable evidence, to its

author. And hence some guilty persons will escape conviction. But that is a strange reason to urge why those should be released whose guilt is unquestioned. But it is pleaded that this law operates unequally upon the rich and the poor. A rich man, by retaining the ablest counsel, will manage so to mystify facts and statements, or to shelter himself under some law technicalities, that the penalty will not reach him, while a poor man is left comparatively unprotected. But it is no more so in the case of a murderer than in that of a thief, or of the perpetrator of any other crime. These are difficulties which grow out of the inequality of men's condition, and can only be remedied by making the notion of even-handed justice more supreme in the human mind. The true point at which to direct our efforts to remedy this evil, is, not to attack and destroy the law, but to render its administration more certain and impartial.

The opponents of capital punishment assert that it is contrary to the true design and object of all proper penal inflictions. They maintain that the legitimate and true design of all punishment is to reform the offender. Upon this point we join issue with them. Penal inflictions are the legitimate results of violated law. They are designed to uphold and defend the majesty of the law, so that it shall be respected and men shall be restrained from its violation. This is their primary object and design. In this way they throw over society the broad shield of their protection. In so far as the reformation of the offender can be secured in furthering the attainment of this end, legislators not only have a right, but are bound in duty to endeavor to secure it. But their first and paramount duty is to protect society. The reformation of the offender is to be regarded as the incidental, and not as the main thing. "Government is formed and maintained, laws and tribunals are established, social obligations are created, man exists as a citizen or a subject, only to promote the common good. On what other foundation, we ask, can civil and political relations rest? from what other principle do they derive their binding force?" It is the general good of society that is to be sought, therefore, by the punishment of the offender. If his reformation can be made consistent with this grand end, it should most certainly be sought; not, however, as a thing for which *he* has a right to make a claim, but as a duty which is made known and enforced by the general law of benevolence.

There is one other argument to which we feel bound to direct attention in this connection. We are told that the infliction of the death penalty comes directly into collision with the example of Christ. He came into the world, not to condemn and execute the sinner, but to save him. We confess there is some seeming plausibility, at first sight, in this argument, but when it is fairly examined, we are persuaded that it will be seen to be *only seemingly* plausible. It is true that Christ's errand was one of mercy, and that his whole example, as well as his teachings, was designed to illustrate and enforce this great object of his mission. But nowhere, in any way, does he seek to bring mercy into collision with justice. He would never have made that most wonderful display of divine mercy, unless he had found means to do so in perfect harmony with the demands of justice. His great object was to magnify the law and make it honorable, by the purity and perfection of his obedience, and then, by the sacrifice of himself to the demands of justice, make it consistent for mercy to be exercised towards the guilty. If those who urge his example against the punishment of the murderer by death, will copy it in their efforts to secure their object, we will bid them a hearty God speed. But we cannot give them much credit for consistency, when in all their efforts they entirely overlook the just demerit of the crime, and expend all their energies in attempts to arouse a morbid sympathy in behalf of the criminal.

We have thus considered the main arguments by which the opponents of the death penalty endeavor to sustain their cause. We do not see that they possess any great weight in themselves considered, aside from any reasons that may be urged against them. They are certainly very far from convincing us of the propriety or justice of the measure which they advocate.

We proceed, in the next place, to inquire,—Is it *safe* to abolish the death penalty? This question, we allow, is a prudential one, but since the object of punishment is the promotion of the general good, by affording protection to society, it is one which may very properly claim its full share of attention. Men are too apt to overlook first principles, in their eagerness to follow the promptings of their sympathetic feelings. Hence it is that much of their benevolent energies are misdirected. And in this case particularly, we think, there has been a strong tendency to overlook entirely, or

greatly to depreciate the educating power of the law. There is always a very striking conformity, in the character of any people, to the laws by which they are governed. This remark is so true that you may always, with great accuracy, determine the one by the other. If, for instance, you find a people given up to the practice of any particular crime, you may judge at once, that there are no very stringent laws among them against that crime ; or, if there are, that they are not uniformly and vigorously enforced. So, on the other hand, if you find the code of laws of any people materially defective in pointing out and prohibiting certain crimes to which human nature is prone, you will, with unfailing certainty, find those crimes rife among them. And hence it is that crime is so fearfully prevalent in a state of anarchy and misrule. The great bulwarks of society are torn down, and its firm foundations upturned.

It is the province of law to define crime, and mark the degree of its turpitude. It does the first by the direct prohibitions which it places upon certain specified acts. Thou shalt not do *this*, or *that*, uttered by the voice of law, marks the thing specified as a crime. Every one who reads that mandate, feels that the act prohibited is of the nature of crime in the estimation of the government. Now it is upon this principle that the people of different nations estimate so differently the character of the same act. A Turkish harem in this country would be regarded as an abomination not to be tolerated. The moral sense of the people would rise up against it, and demand that it should be broken up and suppressed. But in Constantinople it is a perfectly innocent, harmless, and proper thing, in the estimation of the people. Now this difference of feeling and opinion is to be attributed mainly to the educating power of the law. The moral sense of the community is regulated in no small degree by this power. And hence, too, while the crime of murder is looked upon among us, as most abhorrent, the Thugs of India place it among the most exalted virtues. With them, to kill a defenceless foreigner, would be regarded as a most worthy achievement, while, if one of their own number should break caste by eating with a person of inferior grade, it would be a crime sufficient, in their estimation, to banish him forever from their society. These cases are sufficient, perhaps, to illustrate what is meant by the educating power of

law. It defines crime, and, to a great extent, gives tone to public sentiment in regard to it. It also marks its degree of turpitude. This it does by the penalty which it inflicts for its transgression. It is an established principle, that the penalty attached to the violation of any law should be graduated in its severity by the turpitude of the action. The baser the action—the more intimate and sacred the relations which it violates—the more severe should be the penalty, and the more rigorous its enforcement. This is a common sense principle, which commends itself to every candid mind. Punishment, to be just, should always be commensurate with the crime. This being a uniformly admitted principle, the penalty of the law will be taken as the index which marks the degree of the crime. This is the standard by which the citizen is to form his estimate.

Taking this view of the question, it seems to us extremely unsafe to take away the death penalty for murder. We would have human life most sacredly guarded. The community should be made to feel that nothing can be more sacred, and that he who dares to violate it, shall be compelled to pay the most terrible forfeiture. We would not cheapen human life, by reducing the penalty for taking it away to a level with those which are inflicted for any other crime. We would have it stand in the estimation of society, as it really is, the one most preëminent in guilt and atrocity. We would have him feel, who dares to harbor the thought of perpetrating it, that it ought not only to cut him off from the sympathies and society of his fellow men, but even from life itself. We would have him feel that he is not fit to live, even in the most dreary and dismal dungeon that can be found upon this beautiful earth—that his very existence is a loathing and blight to every thing around him.

And here, perhaps, as well as anywhere, we may notice the objection which many urge against capital punishments, that they tend to cheapen the estimate of human life. We have already stated it to be a principle which commends itself to our common sense, that punishment should be commensurate with the desert of the crime. Now if it can be shown that the death penalty for murder is more than the crime merits, we allow there may be some force in the objection. But if, on the contrary, it is shown that it is not too severe, then we deny the force of the objection altogether.

That it is not believed to be too severe by men generally, is evident from the fact that they so uniformly demand its infliction ; and most of those who oppose it would make us believe that imprisonment for life is far more to be dreaded than death itself. So that we may regard it as conceded on all hands that its severity is not too great. But if there be any force in our remarks upon the educating power of law, it will be seen at once that to lower the penalty would be to cheapen the offence in the same degree. We argue, therefore, that to abolish it would tend most directly to lessen men's estimate of the inviolability and sacredness of human life. It would remove from the minds of men that awful sense of the deep and damning turpitude of the crime of taking it away. Do away altogether with the punishment of the murderer, or condemn him to pay only an insignificant fine for his act, and who would feel that his life was of much value in the estimation of society ? We, therefore, throw this objection back into the face of those who urge it, and charge them with taking measures to bring about the very evil which they contend lies at our door.

And it is for this reason, among others, that we deem it exceedingly unsafe to abolish the death penalty. The love of life is admitted to be the strongest passion in the human breast. It is as true now as it ever was, that "all that a man hath will he give for his life." It matters not that now and then an exception may be found, that a few persons can more easily brave death than disgrace,—that some desire death as a relief from the burdens which they bear, being willing to fly from ills which they now have, to those they know not of. These cases are only paroxysms that only briefly and occasionally disturb the usual judgments of the mind. They soon give way to any influence that recalls the mind to its wonted channel of thought. Of all natural evils, we hesitate not to affirm, death is that which takes the strongest hold upon the imaginations of men, and inspires them with the deepest and most prevalent dread. And there is no form of death so frightful as that of a condemned malefactor. To avoid it, he not unfrequently attempts his own life. Men may talk as much as they please about the dread of being secluded within the walls of a prison, and compelled for life to toil without compensation, but who has ever seen the individual who would voluntarily change that condition for

death upon the gallows? Where has the culprit been found, who would not vastly rather be convicted of an offence that would incarcerate him during his life within the walls of a penitentiary than to be found guilty of one that would take his life? Men may speculate and quibble in regard to this matter, but facts which they cannot resist, are against them, and there is no such thing as arguing successfully against *facts*. We feel that society needs this strong fear of death to protect it from the ruthless hand of the murderer, and we believe that God designed it to be used for such a purpose. The fear of death, as a punishment for murder, furnishes a greater restraining motive to a wicked man than any substitute which can be proposed. We say, then, that it is not safe to remove it. We would have it not only threatened against, but executed upon, every guilty offender. The safety and best good of society demand that it should be.

We are often told of the power of kindness and love to restrain and reform men, and we think we appreciate that power as much and as highly as any one. We admit that in many cases it has wrought wonders — that many wanderers from the path of virtue have been reclaimed by it, and made useful and virtuous citizens. But we have yet to learn that it has ever had this effect upon the heart of the deliberate murderer. There are cases over which it has no influence, degrees of guilt and hardness of heart which it cannot reach. And such we believe to be the condition of the deliberate murderer. Of all the classes confined in our penitentiaries, if we may credit the testimony of chaplains, whose business it is to become acquainted with the state of their minds, murderers are the least susceptible to any such influences.

But we come to consider a higher and a still more important question. Is it right to do away with the death penalty in the case of the wilful and deliberate murderer? We confess that all prudential reasons, however pertinently and forcibly urged, would have little influence upon our minds, if it could be clearly made out to be right to abolish it. Did we feel that the question was left to our disposal, and we were at liberty to decide it according to our feelings, we should hesitate long before we should make any prudential reasons merely, however strong and cogent, sufficient to warrant us in depriving a fellow being of life. And we frankly

avow our conviction that no crime, save that of wilful murder, will justify the infliction of this most extreme penalty. We find no positive authority in the Bible for its infliction, in our age of the world, except for this offence.

We proceed, then, to inquire, What are the teachings of the Scriptures upon this subject? Do they, or do they not, demand of us the infliction of this penalty upon the murderer?

We take it to be an admitted and sound principle of scripture interpretation, that whatever commands God has given to man as man are of universal obligation — that they are binding upon all the race — and that no exemption from them can be properly pleaded, except that they have been explicitly annulled by the same authority. We understand the command given to Noah in Genesis 9 : 6, to be of this nature. He stood, at that time, as the acknowledged head and representative of the human race. The generations before him had all been swept away, and all the families of the earth, with the exception of his own, had perished in the deluge of waters. He stood there as the great progenitor of the human family, as the teacher of those regulations by which future generations were to be governed. Among these we find that which requires the death of the deliberate murderer. It is furnished in the most precise and unmistakable language. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed : for in the image of God made he man." In respect to this command there are several things worthy of notice. It was not only given to Noah as the head of the race, when he came forth from the ark, but it is associated with other commands and permissions, all of which are allowed to be of binding force at the present time. Here we have our warrant for taking the lives of animals for food, and here we find that prohibition which requires us to abstain from eating blood ; one which was so strictly enjoined upon the early christians by the apostolic council which met at Jerusalem. Now if all the rest of the commands given to Noah at this time are allowed to be still in force, it seems to us that strong and explicit evidence should be required to show that *this* is not also. We have a right to demand that those who would abrogate this statute, should find some mark that cannot be doubted which denotes that it has been repealed ; otherwise the fact that it is interwoven with those which are of perpetual obligation, must mark it as still being of binding force.

Now we think there is evidence in the language itself, in which the command was given, that it was intended for all time. Noah and his sons are addressed in direct and personal terms, in respect to those other regulations which are admitted to be of perpetual binding force. "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for *you*; even as the green herb have I given *you* all things. But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall *ye* not eat. And surely *your* blood of *your* lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man." Thus far the language is direct and personal. Noah and his sons are addressed by the use of the personal pronouns which specifically designate them. But in the next verse the direct address is abandoned and general terms used. "Whoso sheddeth *man's* blood, by *man* shall his blood be shed." There is no limit given to this language. It states a general command which in no possible way, that we can conceive, can be limited to Noah and his immediate posterity. If any of these requirements was to be of perpetual obligation, the language indicates most unequivocally this to be the one.

The attending circumstances, so far as we can judge, confirm this opinion. We are not informed that any act of murder had then been committed, or that any was even threatened. The narrative justifies us in the conclusion that no such thing was at that time feared. It was given just after the waters of the deluge had been assuaged, and in connection with the first act of religious worship in which that family engaged, after coming out of the ark. It was given in immediate connection with, and formed a part of that covenant of which the seal still remains in the ever recurring bow of heaven. It was delivered, not to the head of a particular tribe or nation, but to the second progenitor of the human race — not under any peculiar and pressing exigency, but at the commencement of a new order of things. It stands at the beginning of the new world, stretching its sanction over all people down to the end of time, to prevent the outbreaking of that violence which had filled the world that was swept away."

Another argument for the perpetuity of this law is found in the reason assigned for the enactment. "For in the image of God made he man." God had two designs in publishing this law: one to prevent the earth from being cursed again

on account of the cry of blood, and the other to impress upon the race the sacredness of his own image. This reason is of as much force now as it ever was. It can have no more applicability to one nation or tribe of men, or to one age, than it has to another. It belongs to humanity. It furnishes as good a ground now why the murderer should be put to death as it ever did. It is founded on the essential nature and relations of man; and with all who believe in the spiritual dignity of a human being, it should exert its full amount of force. "If man be somewhat more than an assemblage of digestive organs, and senses, and an understanding that judges according to sense — if, in addition to these, he has any attributes which reflect however dimly the excellences of the Divinity — then he who wilfully and maliciously defaces this image of God deserves the same doom now, that a like outrage deserved when this law was enacted."

We know it has been urged that this language to Noah has not necessarily the force of a command — that by a slightly different translation, which it will bear without doing any violence to the original, it will read so differently as to destroy all its force as a command. But, we would ask, why attempt to deprive this language of the force of a precept, while you admit that the other passages in its immediate connection possess such a force? Will you take the ground that God did not give *any* regulations or laws to Noah at this time, and that every thing that is here said is a mere "rhetorical flourish?" But we contend that the language has necessarily the force of a direct command, and that it is impossible to abate that force. The language of the preceding verse precludes all mistake upon this point. God there expressly asserts that he *will require* the enforcement of this penalty against both man and beast. Such language cannot be tortured to mean anything short of an express and imperative demand on the part of God himself upon the life of the murderer, and a peremptory requisition upon society to enforce that demand. It was not a mere discretionary power that was lodged with Noah, which he might use, or not, as best suited his inclination or purpose; but he must execute it, or prove recreant to the sacred trust which had been committed to him.

This same law was incorporated into the Jewish code, and its import and design more fully explained by the great Hebrew Legislator. We admit that the fact of its being found

in the Mosaic code, in itself considered, would impose upon us no obligation to adopt and enforce it. Those regulations are not necessarily binding upon us. Many of them were designed to pass away in the dissolution of the system which they were designed to uphold. But the fact of its being found there shows that it was not designed to be repealed, and that God deemed it essential to a well ordered and properly regulated civil government. By placing it there he most solemnly reaffirms its justice, and his determination to require its enforcement. He sees fit to guard it by additional restrictions — by strictly prohibiting that sickly sympathy which would rescue the guilty man from the deadly grasp of the executioner. While for other crimes commutation is allowed, this alone is singled out, and God says, "Thou shalt take no ransom for the life of the murderer, he shall surely be put to death. Thine eye shall not pity, neither shalt thou spare: he shall be put to death, lest the land be defiled, for blood it defileth the land." Thus strongly is the infliction of this penalty guarded by the divine command.

And here we cannot forbear to utter our unqualified condemnation of the course pursued by the opponents of capital punishment, in their attempts to hold up to public odium and disgrace the officers of the government, because they are determined that the law shall be maintained. It will be a sad day, we think, when the executive officers of the government shall feel themselves authorized, by the clamor of the citizens, to step in between the law and its victim, and assume the place of legislators and judges, instead of executioners of the law. We hope we may long be delivered from such rulers as will suffer their own private views and feelings, or the taunts of the mob, to deter them from the discharge of their duties in accordance with the solemn oaths which they have taken.

We come now to inquire, Has this law been repealed either by the Spirit or teachings of the Great Lawgiver under the New Testament dispensation? We are aware that this is claimed, and, if the claim be well sustained, those who make it have gained their point, for we bow with reverence to his authority. But we must protest at the outset against applying those teachings which were given to man in his individual capacity, to civil society. Man as a citizen, and man as an individual, sustains very different relations. We have yet o

learn that Christ ever gave any specific regulations by which society is to be governed. He declared that his kingdom was not of this world, and we doubt very much if it can be shown that he has in any way contradicted that assertion by stooping to intermeddle with the regulations of civil society. His mission was to the individual heart and conscience, and if these could be made right, there was little fear that society in its organized capacity would not secure its own legitimate aims. We know that some have attempted to interpret the teachings of Christ in such a way as to make them opposed to the administration of civil justice. They would have us believe that the spirit of the sermon on the mount throughout forbids all kinds of penal inflictions. And we confess, that upon the premises which they assume, namely, that those principles in their full extent are to be applied to the regulation of society as such, we are unable to resist their conclusions. We can no more see how we can love our enemies, and do good to those who despitefully use us and persecute us, while we incarcerate them in a prison, or even impose upon them a paltry fine, than when we inflict upon them the death penalty, provided they deserve it. But we cannot concede for a moment, that either the spirit or teachings of Christ conflict with the claims of justice. It is true Christ prohibited private revenge, and removed the false gloss which the scribes and pharisees had put upon some portions of the law of Moses. But that he ever intended any of his instructions so to be interpreted as to prohibit the civil magistrate from inflicting the penalty of the law upon any guilty offender, we do not believe.

But admitting that Christ did abrogate the whole of the Mosaic ritual — that it all became null and void, both in its civil and religious bearings, when he had finished the work which had been given him to perform, we cannot see how it could affect a previously existing law, given to the race as such, ages before that ritual had any existence. As the law of death for the murderer has been placed upon the statute-book of God, and been enforced by the divine sanctions for ages, we have a right to demand that a full and specific repeal of it by the same authority shall be shown us, before we shall feel at liberty to dispense with it. We ask, then, has Christ done it? In one instance, certainly, his attention was directed to this law, and he gave us his definition of murder.

Did he then repeal the death penalty? If he designed to condemn it, or to abrogate it, we should expect he would do it then. In the 21st verse of the 5th chapter of Matthew, Christ thus refers to this law: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment." This was the time and place for him to have repealed this law, if he had intended to do so. Does he say, "But I say unto you, ye shall not inflict judgment upon the murderer; henceforth this statute shall no longer be in force?" He says no such thing. "But I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." So far from repealing this law he extends its claims and penalties even to the passions and emotions of the heart, and assures us that God will punish these even more severely than men punish the deliberate murderer. He thus reaffirms this law, carries it back and makes it to grasp the first movings of the intention to murder, and then points the individual onward to that final and more fearful retribution which awaits him in the eternal world.

The conduct and teachings of the apostles on this subject were in striking conformity with that of their Master. They never intimated that they thought this law repealed. They nowhere taught that it was unlawful to take the life of the murderer. On the contrary, Paul affirms his willingness to submit to this extreme penalty of the law, if, after a fair trial, he shall be found to be guilty of a crime deserving it. And he instructs the Romans, that the civil power which wields the sword for the protection of society is an appointment of God — that it "is a minister of God, a revenger of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." So far, then, we regard the spirit and teachings of the New Testament altogether in favor of the infliction of the death penalty upon the murderer. We regard it as sinful to pass upon him any other doom. God, by the declarations of his own will, and by the voice of his authority, has determined that the guilty individual shall have the term of his probation cut short by human hands, and by this means be summoned to appear at his bar to answer for the defacement of his own image.

But we are told that this law had its origin in the infancy

of society — that it was designed and adapted only for a barbarous people, and that to enforce it in this age is abhorrent to every feeling and principle of humanity. We have been accustomed to think that God's laws are all just — that the principle of equity is never lost sight of in his legislation. We conclude, therefore, that he considered this a just penalty when he affixed it to the crime of murder. We have also been taught to believe that a man's responsibilities increase in the ratio of his enlightenment and means of improvement. This is a principle of which we think few will deny the correctness. We had almost affirmed it to be instinctive. Now, we ask, if it were just in God to require the infliction of this penalty upon the murderer in the infancy of society, when the rights of the individual and of society were but partially and indefinitely understood, how is it that it has become unjust when those rights are fully defined and properly marked? We should like to know, if an ignorant and heathen man deserves to die for killing his fellow man, what he deserves who does the same deed in the midst of the light of civilization and Christianity? Will some of the opposers of capital punishment solve this problem? We admit that we live in an age of progress, and of wonderful improvement; but we do not believe that we have outstripped the wisdom of the Creator, or that the Eternal One has made any very new and mighty discoveries of truth and justice during the brief period of this world's history.

We have only to say, in conclusion, that if we have taken the true view of this subject, a great responsibility is resting, not only on those who would blot this divine statute from all human codes, and thus pave the way for setting aside the authority of God altogether in human legislation, but also upon those who are the friends of justice and law. The time has come when long established principles are sought to be uprooted, and new and fearfully dangerous experiments made to take their place. We are no enemies of progress, nor are we alarmists. We believe there is enough of firmness and conservatism in the minds of the people to resist all the attempts of disorganizers. But we confess we see some cause of apprehension, when men occupying the place of jurors are found willing to disregard the solemnities of their oath and yield to the appeals which are made to their sympathies in behalf of the guilty. We would have no man condemned but upon the

clearest and most undoubted testimony. We would give the accused every advantage which the law allows, to show his innocence, and if there be a well-founded doubt, that should be sufficient to secure his acquittal. But when the case is a clear and decided one, we call upon jurors, as they fear God and hope to meet his approbation, to do their duty. The well-being of society demands it of them ; God requires it at their hands, nor will he hold them guiltless if they refuse to heed his requisition.

ARTICLE IV.

Sacred Rhetoric, or Composition and Delivery of Sermons, by HENRY J. RIPLEY, Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Duties, in the Newton Theological Institution, to which are added Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching, by Henry, Ware, Jr., D.D. Boston: Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln, 1849, pp. 259.

THIS work is the contribution of a diligent and successful instructor to the science and the art — for rhetoric is both a science and an art — which he has long been engaged in teaching. It embodies the results of experience and learning which the author has been accumulating for many years, and is designed to meet the wants which he has found to exist among the numerous theological students and ministers with whom he has become acquainted in the course of his professional duties. Knowing as we do the faithful care and the excellent judgment with which Professor Ripley is accustomed to execute every work which he undertakes, we were prepared to give it our confidence in advance ; and we entered upon its examination in the full expectation that we should find it worthy of the source from which it emanates, and in every respect a valuable aid to all who are engaged either in the study or the practice of Sacred Rhetoric. This expectation has been entirely realized ; and after a careful reading of the book, we do not hesitate to express the opinion that as a treatise on the composition and delivery of sermons, it is decidedly superior to any of those now in use in our theolog-

ical seminaries. The excellent lectures of the late Dr. Porter on Homiletics and Preaching, contain a greater variety of collateral information, and should still be carefully read by every candidate for the duties of the pulpit; but as a text book for students, though highly instructive in several important particulars, they are too diffuse, and are also wanting in scientific arrangement and didactic precision. Similar objections have also been made to Fenelon's Dialogues and Campbell's Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence. Though containing many valuable precepts and suggestions, they are but ill suited to the purposes of the instructor in his class-room, where, after all, nothing can be really satisfactory that is not definite, clear, and precise — such as the student may readily comprehend and apply to the subjects on which he is engaged.

Of this latter character is the treatise of Professor Ripley. It was designed to be used as a text-book in Sacred Rhetoric, and by the comprehensiveness of its topics, the distinctness of its divisions, and the clearness of its arrangement, it is well suited to the purpose. It is brief, yet we believe it treats, with sufficient fullness, of all the principles which belong to the subject, and contains many important practical suggestions, and some entire topics, which we have met with in no other author. Its aim is to set forth the principles by which a discourse should be composed, to trace the intellectual processes that are to be gone through with in the work of writing, and thus to show the student the manner in which a good sermon must be prepared, rather than that in which a poor one may be criticised. In doing this, the professor has divided the discourses of the pulpit into two classes — Subject Sermons and Text Sermons — a division which had before been suggested by Gresley in his Treatise on Preaching, and which is evidently very convenient for the purposes of instruction. The different characters and uses of these two classes are distinctly set forth, and the manner in which the different parts of a sermon of each class should be prepared, is made the subject of a series of consecutive chapters, which are exceedingly full and satisfactory in the precepts and illustrations which they contain. These are followed by a chapter on the characteristics of sermons, a second on the style of sermons, and a third on the delivery of sermons, each of which is filled with judicious and valuable instruc-

tions and cautions concerning the features of thought, the style and the delivery suited to discourses from the pulpit, on the great themes of christian truth.

The chapter on delivery presents a brief account of the three modes of preaching which have been adopted by divines, and sets forth the advantages and disadvantages which belong to each. The first of these is that of reading the sermon from the manuscript; the second is that of repeating it from memory precisely as it has been written, and the third is extemporaneous preaching, or delivering the train of thought after long meditation upon the subject, and careful preparation in the mind of the preacher, but without committing it to writing. Each of these methods has been adopted by eminent and successful preachers; each possesses advantages peculiar to itself; and each has perils and evils of its own, which should never be lost sight of by those who adopt it. The practice of combining the three in a single discourse—of writing it in full for the purpose of becoming familiar with the subject and mastering the train of thought, and then delivering it partly from memory and partly in language suggested at the moment, is said to be sanctioned by the example of Professor Tholuck, but is by no means recommended by the author. In this we are persuaded he is correct; we have never known it to be adopted in this country with any thing like high success, and we believe it involves intrinsic difficulties which very few preachers can hope to overcome. Without overcoming them, their delivery will be almost sure to illustrate a large proportion of the faults belonging to all the three methods which they aim to combine.

The practice of reciting from memory, combined with the habit of occasional enlargement and digression, though not particularly favored by the author in the work before us, yet seems to us to have many advantages over either of the others, especially for those in whom the faculty of memory is ready and retentive. To some, the practice is, doubtless, wholly unattainable; to others, attainable only by great effort; and in all cases, the chief objection to it seems to lie in the time and the labor which are required for the double work of writing and of committing to memory what is written. Yet it is by no means certain that by better methods of educating the memory, and greater care for its discipline and improvement, this

faculty may not be made to retain and readily to recall, with slight additional attention, whatever we have once taken pains to write. Indeed, in many minds the memory possesses this power to the full, at certain periods of life, and the facility with which many of our New England orators and lecturers have acquired the art of reciting long discourses without a single reference to their manuscript, shows that this power is far more easily attainable than is ordinarily supposed. We regard the practice of preaching thus from memory what has been carefully meditated and written, as worthy of much more attention than it is now receiving, especially from students and from young ministers, — for to those whose habits are already fixed it presents far greater difficulties. Wherever it can be adopted without too great a sacrifice of time and labor, it will be found most readily to obviate the objections which one class of persons are constantly uttering to the reading of sermons, and those which another class are sure to feel, even if they do not express, to all preaching which is extemporaneous.

Between these two modes of preaching, Professor Ripley allows the student free choice, though he strongly recommends to all the practice of both, as each is the better suited to different occasions and different kinds of congregations. We think, however, it may be seriously doubted whether the practice of preaching extemporaneously, as it is called, is really growing in favor with the public. We know that there are congregations in some parts of the country, that will tolerate no other kind of preaching, but we suspect that the increase of knowledge and the progress of intellectual culture and refinement naturally create a demand for an exacter mode of statement, and a more direct and didactic form of address, than are usually found in unwritten discourses. Besides, such is the serious nature of the message which is delivered from the pulpit, and so vast the difference between truth and error on the momentous themes of religion, that thoughtful hearers feel an instinctive aversion to anything like random statements or careless reasoning in the sermons to which they listen. To such hearers, the incorrect expressions, the exaggerated style, the labored and hesitating manner which too often mark the performances of extemporaneous preachers, are exceedingly distasteful and unsatisfactory. They beget an apprehension that what is delivered with so much difficulty and labor, or in

a style of such impetuous declamation, may not be the simple truth of the gospel, or, at least, that the truth may not be carefully interpreted and accurately stated. An apprehension like this destroys confidence in what the preacher says, and gives rise to the impression that much of his discourse is really unpremeditated or suggested at the moment of delivery.

That all cause for this apprehension may be effectually removed from the style and manner of many ministers, we have no question whatever; but we believe there will still be many left who can never overcome the obstacles to success which are always encountered by those who attempt this mode of preaching. Where it is successful, it has many advantages over every other, both in enlisting the attention and in persuading the will; but in order that it succeed in any high degree, there are demanded peculiar gifts, a richer intellectual culture, and more varied resources, both of invention and of knowledge, than are required in the writing of sermons. They who possess these qualities will alone be proof against the temptations to loose and general preparation, or to turgid and ranting delivery, which invariably beset the extemporaneous preacher. The advantages and the disadvantages of the two methods are fully pointed out by Professor Ripley, and in his recommendation of the extemporaneous method to all candidates for the pulpit, he is entirely sustained by the views of Dr. Ware, in his excellent "Hints," and by the practice of many eminent preachers, of every christian denomination.

The science of rhetoric, so far as its fundamental principles are concerned, has undergone but few changes since the time in which Aristotle first reduced it to order and gave to it the character of a science. He was its earliest systematic teacher, and though the principles laid down by him have received many new applications in the writings of Cicero and Quintilian, and many more in those of later authors, the principles themselves remain, almost without change or modification, as they were first promulgated in the Lyceum at Athens by this ancient master of philosophy. Of these applications, the eloquence of the pulpit is the latest and the noblest form, and one which will become more important with every succeeding age of christian civilization. The study of it is one of the most imperative duties of those who are preparing for the high office of the christian minister, and its practice is the chosen instrumentality which God has appointed for the

conversion of men. The power to interpret the gospel aright, and the power to enforce its doctrines and precepts upon the intellect and the heart by written or spoken discourse, are the great elements which compose the character of the able christian preacher. Each is of transcendent importance, and neither should ever be neglected in the period allotted to theological education.

It has of late been frequently remarked that the work of training preachers as such, has been too much neglected in our New England seminaries; that Professors have devoted themselves too exclusively to making those who receive their instructions, acute and profound theologians, to the neglect both of style and of oratory; that while the students are ceaselessly drilled in exegesis and systematic divinity, they have been allowed to make their own way as best they might, into the mysteries of the composition and delivery of sermons. The remark, we are obliged to admit, is not without foundation, and the early performances of those who have been thus educated, have too often evinced the decided bias which their minds have received towards the subtleties of a speculative and comparatively barren theological system. We would by no means intimate that the minister of Christ is to neglect this species of learning, or especially that he is to undervalue any of the means by which the Scriptures may be rightly interpreted. We only ask that these may not be his only, or even his absorbing studies. The pulpit, though ever so learned, should not be dull — and however rich in instruction its discourses may be, they will fail of their true object, unless they are addressed to the human intellect and heart in accordance with the laws of our spiritual natures. These laws the minister must comprehend as they are exhibited in all the varieties of character and all the phenomena of action, as unfolded in books and as illustrated in daily life, and by them must he be governed in directing his arguments and appeals, his instructions and his reproofs, to those whom he may be called upon to address. It is not, by any means, the simple study of sacred rhetoric, or the teachings of a Professor, however able and experienced, that can alone furnish for him the power he needs. With these as aids and guides, he must nourish it in himself; he must quicken his own sensibilities and observe their minutest workings; he must learn to convert abstract truths, however familiar, into glowing images,

and shape them into words of power as he holds them forth to the consciences of men. In the words of Milton, so aptly quoted by Dr. Ware in his "Hints" on extemporaneous preaching, "True eloquence I find to be none but the serious and hearty love of truth, and that whose mind soever is fully possessed with a fervent desire to know good things, and with the dearest charity to infuse the knowledge of them into others, — when such a man would speak, his words, like so many nimble and airy servitors, trip about him at command, and in well-ordered files, as he could wish, fall aptly into their own places."

Professor Ripley in the volume before us by no means overlooks this fundamental law of our natures, but, on the contrary, frequently directs the attention of the student to it, as a matter of primary importance in forming his habits and developing his powers both as an orator and a writer. He very properly omits the elementary principles of the grammatical and rhetorical arts which pertain alike to every species of composition, and, supposing the student familiar with the treatises of Campbell and Whately in which these are contained, he presents only those which belong to the composition and delivery of sermons in distinction from other kinds of public discourse. The treatise, as we have already said, seems to us to be exceedingly judicious and well fitted to its design, and, taken in connection with the "Hints" on extemporaneous preaching by the late Dr. Ware which are appended to it, it furnishes all that a student can desire or properly expect from a text-book in the work of training himself for the duties of the pulpit.

ARTICLE V.

University Sermons, Delivered in the chapel of Brown University, BY FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of the University.

THE appearance of this volume we announced in the January number of the Review, and promised our readers a more extended notice of the work in a future number. We have waited in the hope that some more experienced writer

might be induced to take the work in hand, and notice it as its merits deserve. But we can no longer forbear enriching our pages with some extracts from the volume, at the same time offering such suggestions as have forced themselves upon our own mind in its perusal. Our estimate of the work as a whole, has already been given. We need only add that a reperusal of it has only confirmed us in the opinion we have already expressed, and heightened our estimate of its value. We speak not in the language of flattery, and we know we express not only our own deliberate opinion, but that also of others, well qualified to judge of its merits, when we say there has nothing appeared from our religious press for many a day, that for vigor of thought, cogency of reasoning, vividness of conception, and lucidness of style, will compare with these sermons. They are not indeed sermons in the ordinary acception of the term, (though they conform more nearly to the ideal standard of what we conceive a sermon should be than anything we have for a long time read,) but they are deep, thorough discussions of the various subjects of which they treat, such as we should expect to hear from the chair of one of the first moral philosophers of the age, rather than from the pulpit. A volume of sermons is something we never read. We have several such in our library, and there are individual sermons in each that we have read with interest. But of none of them can we say we have read them through, except the volume before us. But we have read this to the end with undiminished interest; and when we addressed ourselves to its reperusal, we found a freshness still that enabled us to read many parts of it with even greater satisfaction than at first. Though not designed ostensibly to contain a system of theology, yet, commencing with the first elementary principle of religious truth, the existence of God, the author proceeds step by step to develop the most essential truths of the gospel system, and the most important principles of moral duty. And throughout the analysis is so clear that you seem to be led along through a pathway of light to the conclusions to which you are conducted. The exact point to be proved, or illustrated, ever stands out with a distinctness that scarcely admits of a possibility of mistake. But the highest excellence of the work is the sound views of moral and religious truth it contains. Coming from such a source, it will be quoted as authority on the various questions upon which it

treats. Hence its truths become doubly valuable, or, if it contained error, it would be doubly pernicious. We are glad, therefore, to find so little in it to which we cannot most heartily subscribe. True, the author views some subjects from a different point of vision from which we have been accustomed, and still prefer to view them. But while we can find the truth itself in its integrity, with none of its essential features wanting or obscured, we do not object to beholding it in a new aspect. There may be reasons why we prefer to present a truth in one particular light, as harmonizing more fully, in our estimation, with the language of scripture, and as less liable to misapprehension; yet another mind may see it more distinctly in another light, and hence be able better to present it to the apprehension of faith, in that aspect. And there is an advantage in contemplating truth in all its various relations. The whole of a truth is never seen from one point of vision. Like a landscape it must be viewed from various points in order to take in all its features. And then all the different parts of the picture need to be combined into one harmonious whole. This is especially true of the great doctrines of Christianity. Scarcely a tithe of their deep import will probably ever be apprehended in this world, with all the research of the millions of minds that are engaged in their investigation. But whenever an original mind comes to their examination, it is likely to fix for itself a new stand-point, and by doing so not only sees the truth more clearly itself, but also prepares the way for the more perfect understanding of it by others. Thus though no absolutely new truth is discovered, the boundary of thought is enlarged. Old familiar truths become invested with new interest. They acquire a higher meaning, and a deeper import, and are found susceptible of wider and more various applications. The danger is when men, having beheld a subject in one aspect, imagine that they have seen all of truth there is connected with it, and hence set themselves to break down all the landmarks that other minds have fixed in order to make way for their particular view.

This volume breathes no such spirit. The object of the author is to build up, not to pull down. And though he sometimes travels out of the ordinary course and presents some of the doctrines of Christianity in different aspects from what we have been accustomed to view them, yet

we find little in their examination to which we do not most heartily accord. The first two sermons contain an argument for the divine existence that for convincing power we have rarely seen equalled, and which presents the insanity and folly of theoretical and practical atheism in the strongest light. And his closing appeal to those who deny the existence of their Maker, or who, believing in his existence, still live as though these truths were mere fictions of the imagination, are full of point and force.

"Whence," says he, "hath arisen this atheism in the intelligent, responsible, and highly-favored creatures of God? How is it that thinking beings should deny the existence of their Maker, and that immortal and accountable spirits, convinced of the reality of his existence and attributes, should act as though these truths were a fiction of the imagination? To this question I think but one answer can be given, and it is found in the words of the apostle Paul — Because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over. It is because we do not love the moral attributes of God that we first refuse submission to his authority, and then either deny his existence or say unto him, Depart from us, for we desire not a knowledge of thy ways. Thus, as in other cases, we yield obedience to our passions rather than to our reason and our conscience, and testify to the truth of the assertion of holy writ — The carnal mind is enmity against God. Is not this true of every one of us who is living without God in the world? Would you not think of God if you loved him? Would you not obey him if you loved him? Retire within your own bosoms, and let each one decide for himself whether these things be so.

"And, if this be so, whither, I pray you, doth it tend, and what must be the end thereof? When you put aside this tabernacle of flesh, how will you stand before God, with the temper of fixed enmity to his character unchangeably interwoven with your spiritual nature? What means do you possess for carrying on this warfare? Can you contend with omnipotence? Can you deceive omniscience? Can you sustain yourself under the frown of all-consuming holiness? Do you not perceive that enmity with God involves within itself the essential elements of unutterable woe?"

The three following discourses on the moral character of man are full of striking thought and cogent reasoning, and we think present the doctrine of human depravity in its true light, and establish it upon a basis that must commend itself to every candid observant mind. We give a brief extract defining the sense in which he regards man as depraved:

"Nor have I the least design to defend the terms used by many writers on this subject. We desire to deal not with names, but with things; not with words, but with matters of fact. It has, sometimes,

for instance, been the custom to designate the moral corruption of man by the term 'total depravity.' Definitions, I know, may be given of this phrase which would render it not inconsistent with what I suppose to be the revealed truth; still I think that this truth might be expressed by more fitly chosen words. When we modify an adjective by the epithet 'total,' we mean, I think, to declare that the quality pervades the subject without admixture or alleviation. That thing is not *totally* black which presents any intermingling of colors. If *depraved* mean sinful, *totally depraved* would seem to mean sinful in such a sense as to exclude the existence of virtue. Now, I do not perceive that such a character is ascribed to man in the Scriptures. If, on the other hand, this expression indicates that though there may be virtue in human action irrespective of divine grace, yet that in no case it fulfils the conditions of the laws of God, this may be true, but the truth might, as I think, be expressed by more appropriate terms.

"Ruined and helpless as the moral condition of man is represented to be in the Scriptures, they do not assert that there is in his nature none of the elements of goodness. So far as we can discover, they nowhere assert that filial or parental affection, patriotism, generosity, or benevolence, are either vicious, or to be classed with the instinctive and therefore morally neutral impulses of brutes. The principles of ethics would teach us that such a view was erroneous. The intentional fulfilment of a moral obligation must, as it seems to me, be virtuous. It may not be as virtuous as it ought to be. It may be wanting in some of the elements necessary to a perfect moral action, and, therefore, it may *come short* of the praise of God. So far, however, as it is the intentional fulfilment of a moral obligation, it is virtuous, and I think that all men correctly honor it as such. There are surely gradations in moral character irrespective of the transforming influences of the grace of God. When the young ruler came to inquire of Christ, there was much that was wanting to render him acceptable to God; yet the Saviour looked upon him and loved him. Our Lord clearly beheld in him a character very different from that of the Scribes and Pharisees who surrounded him."

* * * * *

"I have already remarked that the standard by which the moral character of man is to be judged, is the law, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself. He who obeys this rule is innocent; his moral character is perfect; he will receive praise from God. He who fails to obey it is imperfect, sinful, and is shut out from all claim to justification on the ground of the law. We shall proceed, on this occasion, to examine the declarations of revelation respecting the character of man, in view of the first part of the precept, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." * *

"The words of our Saviour affirm distinctly what is our moral character in respect to our obligations to God. 'I know you,' said he, 'that ye have not the love of God in you.' That this assertion was not intended to refer exclusively to his immediate hearers, but that it was universally true, is evident from his declaration on another occasion. 'This is the condemnation,' said he, 'that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.'"

We are pleased with this definition of human depravity. Though we would not advocate rash changes, even in the terminology of theological science, lest with the change of expression the doctrines themselves become changed; yet when any term becomes so liable to misapprehension that it can never be safely used without explanation, we think it time that it fall into disuse, and another be substituted in its place that is more unequivocal in its import. We think this is the case with the term "total depravity." It always needs defining. Something must be subtracted from the meaning that the term naturally conveys. And we have no doubt the doctrine itself has often been rejected simply on account of the unfortunate language (as we regard it) in which it has been conveyed. In the sense in which it is generally understood by evangelical christians, of entire destitution of that controlling principle that should ever govern human conduct, love to God, it is unquestionably true. But the language implies more. Without qualifying explanations, men almost uniformly understand more by it. We think, therefore, the essence of the doctrine may be retained while the term is abandoned.

From the demonstration of the fact of the universal sinfulness of our race, the author proceeds, in the sixth discourse, to an inquiry into the cause of this universal tendency to evil. This he finds, as all must do who regard either the teachings of divine inspiration as authoritative on the subject, or the deductions of sound reasoning, in the fall of man as given in Genesis. We have often wondered how any man could admit that all men are sinners and yet deny this hereditary tendency to evil. Should all at a certain time who drank of the Croton water be poisoned, we should think it a strange process of reasoning, if a man should attempt to prove that some one had been about to every house and poisoned the cups out of which each one had drank, rather than that the fountain itself had been poisoned. And it certainly is not less strange when men admit the universal sinfulness of men and yet look for the cause in a distinct fall of each individual, instead of believing, according to the Bible account, that human nature was poisoned in its fountain, and from our progenitor it has flowed down to all our race. The doctrine of the Fall the author thus states:

"1. Our first parents were created free agents; that is, moral intelligences.

"2. They were placed under circumstances in which their virtue was subjected to trial.

"3 By the constitution under which our race was created, the conditions of our probation were so interwoven with theirs that if they became sinful we should become sinful also."

Placed under such a constitution, Adam, our progenitor, sinned and thus involved all our race in the consequences of the Fall. The seventh discourse develops the truth which is the necessary result of this state of sinfulness in which man is found, viz., that justification by the law was impossible. The eighth and ninth bring to view the preparation that Jehovah had made under previous dispensations for the advent of the Messiah. We pass over these to the tenth, on "The Work of the Messiah." We had the pleasure of listening to this discourse when it was delivered in the chapel of the University, and rarely have we ever listened to a sermon with such intense interest. Nor do we ever recollect to have been so deeply impressed with the moral sublimity of the scenes of Calvary, and of the Saviour's character, as there exhibited. And we are sure we can do no better service to our readers who have not the volume, than by inserting an extract from the closing part of this discourse.

"Such was the life of Christ. But he had yet a baptism to be baptized with, in comparison with which all that he had yet undergone was tolerable. In view of this, he prayed his Father that, if it were possible, this cup might pass from him. He prayed thus three times. The anticipation of the trial through which he must pass, so overwhelmed his physical nature, that the blood gushed from every pore, forced out by agony too great for human endurance.

"In order to estimate the intensity of the Messiah's suffering, consider, for a moment, the elements of agony that were concentrated in the crisis of his passion. The slight consolations that he had received from human sympathy were withdrawn, and he was delivered up into the hands of merciless ruffians. His disciples leave him alone, and one, the oldest and the most zealous, denies, with imprecations, that he had ever even known him. Human malice is unchained, that it may exert upon him its whole power without control. The Lamb of God is smitten with the fist, spit upon, and crowned with thorns. All this is but the prelude to death in its most agonizing form. The immaculate Son of God must endure the public death of an ignominious felon. What death is, no one of us can know from experience; much less can we know what is endured in a violent, lingering, and cruel death by murder. But every one who has stood by the bedside of a departing friend, can form some, though it be an inadequate, conception of that hour when the powers of the mind are prostrated by disease, and the soul, environed on every side by the extremity of suffering, feels the

power of self-government giving way under the pressure of intolerable anguish. If such be death to any one of us, what must it have been to pass through this hour as the Messiah did, with the destinies of the world suspended on his sinless obedience?

"But this was not all. The infernal spirits had thus far tempted him utterly in vain. The warfare was nearly accomplished, and as yet they had achieved no victory; one conflict only remained. The last effort was now to be made, and with better prospect of success than they had before dared to hope for. They had succeeded in isolating the Saviour from every human aid. The moment of nature's weakness was the time of their chosen opportunity. The Messiah must come specially within their power, as he was delivering the race of man from it forever. 'It was their hour, and the power of darkness.' Every earthly support had been withdrawn from him. The very power of self-control was trembling under the pressure of agony too great to be endured. The will could scarcely retain its authority amidst the struggles of expiring nature. Now, now, could the Messiah be tempted to sin; now, could he be made to yield even to an unholy thought, or put forth an impatient desire, their whole work would be accomplished. The whole power of hell was therefore concentrated to overwhelm him at this awful crisis. Under such conditions did the Saviour pass through the hour of death.

"But lastly: up to this hour, the Spirit had been poured out without measure upon him. Thus far he had been upheld by constant and reciprocal communion with his Father and our Father, with his God and our God. But at this moment, even this light, that had thus far cheered him, was withdrawn, and he passed through the valley of the shadow of death in utter darkness. All support, created and uncreated, was removed, and he was left to the unaided strength of his own personal virtue. What an hour was that in the annals of eternity! The endless destiny of countless myriads, the honor of the law of God, the decision of that contest which must end in the triumph of heaven or the triumph of hell, the question whether Messiah should sink under the curse of the law to which he had subjected himself, or be raised in his assumed nature to the throne of the universe, — all were suspended upon the strength of the Saviour's virtue under this awful trial. He cried, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' There was darkness over all the land. There was silence in heaven. Seraphim and cherubim, awe-struck, looked down upon this unparalleled moral contest. On its issue there seems to have depended the happiness or misery of the moral universe of God.

"The moments of agony slowly rolled away. The powers of hell had gained no advantage. The Messiah, strong in his own unaided virtue, had baffled every attack of earth and hell, and shone glorious in untarnished holiness. His last moment has arrived. Doth he yet maintain his integrity? Doth he, amidst these unfathomable trials of his benevolence, still love his neighbor as himself? Harken to the prayer that quivers upon his parched and feverish lips: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Although forsaken of his Father and his God, doth he yet trust in him with filial confidence? Harken again: 'Father, in thy hands I commit my spirit.' The warfare was accomplished. The victory was won. He said, 'It is finished, and gave up the ghost.'

"The work was done. The victory was achieved. He had sustained his unparalleled trial, holy, harmless, and undefiled. The law of God was magnified and made honorable. An illustration of the holiness of God had been made, so glorious that the condemnation of the race of man would have been as nothing to it. The subtilty of the hosts of hell was turned to foolishness. The malignity of Satan was covered with eternal shame. The seed of the woman had crushed the head of the serpent. The race of Adam was delivered from the curse of the law, and a way, even into the holiest of holies, was opened to us, through the blood of the everlasting covenant. 'Mercy and truth had met together, righteousness and peace had kissed each other.' Every attribute of God shone forth upon the whole moral universe with a new and more resplendent effulgence."

After quoting such a passage, it is but cold praise to say that with the views here expressed of the obedience of Christ and the infinite interests dependent upon it we fully accord. We can only express our regret that another aspect of the Messiah's work, to which the author alludes in a foot-note, is not presented with equal distinctness and prominence. He says —

"It may be objected to the view here taken, that I have not duly considered the class of passages which lay a peculiar stress on the blood of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, the death of Christ as procuring our redemption, the offering up of Christ, &c. To this I would reply, that I by no means have forgotten these passages, nor am I disposed, in the least degree, to attenuate their meaning. No view of any subject of revelation can be correct if it do not allow the full and obvious meaning of every class of passages which treat upon that subject. It may, therefore, be proper to remark that, in treating of the work of Christ, the Scriptures seem to me to develop two ideas — the one, the obedience of Christ to the law; the other, the offering up of himself as a sacrifice for sin. It is to the first of these alone that the attention of the reader is directed in the present discourse. The subject is further considered in the following sermon."

After this intimation we confess we felt no little disappointment when, in reading the succeeding sermon to which he directs our attention, we found the following passage: —

"The Scriptures, as you must all have perceived, speak with great emphasis of the death of Christ, of his *offering up himself*, and being by his death specially the means of our redemption. It may be that there were some parts of this great transaction that could be perfected only at or after his death. It may be that in death he offered himself up as an expiatory sacrifice, ready and willing to bear all that the law of God might require as the price of our redemption. This may be

the meaning of the apostle when he says, 'If the blood of bulls and of goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit,' (in his eternal spiritual nature,) '*offered up himself without spot* to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?' Here the apostle seems to refer to the offering up of himself after he had shown himself to be without spot. This would lead us to believe that a part of this great work of the Messiah was to be performed after death. It seems to intimate that after his obedience on earth was complete, he surrendered himself up, to suffer in our behalf all that was necessary in order to render our pardon and redemption consistent with infinite holiness. His obedience, however, had been so transcendent in virtue, he had so triumphantly vanquished all our spiritual enemies, and put to shame all the powers of darkness, that I know not whether any thing more was demanded. 'The Lord was well pleased for his righteousness' sake,' (his obedience,) 'for he had magnified the law and made it honorable.' That this was the case would seem probable, because there is no reference in the Scriptures to his suffering after death. This offering up of himself, however, may have belonged to the invisible world. Earth had no theatre on which such a scene could have been enacted. It belonged to the spiritual world; it had respect to the whole creation of spiritual intelligences, and before them alone could it be appropriately displayed."

And our readers may perhaps sympathize with us in this disappointment when we inform them that this paragraph contains all that is said in this discourse of the offering up of Christ as a sacrifice for sin. We confess that this representation of the work of the Messiah does not satisfy us. Not that we suspect Dr. Wayland of any heresy on the doctrine of the atonement. Probably could the reader gain precisely his point of vision and view the subject in his light, and with the same penetrating search, he might find the statement of it sufficiently clear and explicit. But we think he has failed to define his stand-point with sufficient distinctness, to enable those who have been accustomed to view the doctrine in another aspect readily to enter into his views. Hence they are liable to misapprehension. The author evidently understands more by the obedience of Christ than is usually implied by this language. He makes it include, not his acts alone, but also his suffering—to involve all that the apostle implies when he says he was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." It was not simply obedience to the moral law, but the obedience involved in the declaration of the Saviour: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." "By the which will," the apostle tells us, "we are sanctified by the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ." It was a voluntary submission to

all that the Father saw necessary to inflict upon him when "it pleased the Lord to bruise him, to put him to grief and make his soul an offering for sin." The sufferings were not incidental to his obedience, but they formed an essential part of it. They constituted the cup which the Father gave him to drink. Hence, Jesus says as he approaches the period of his last agony, "Father, save me from this hour, yet for this purpose came I unto this hour." The cross was the point towards which all his previous work on earth tended, and in which it found its consummation. "He came to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself." To it he was delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. To say that Christ by his holy life exposed himself to trial and persecution, scorn and reproach, and finally to a martyr's death, does not meet the absolute demands of scripture language on this point. The Bible makes those expiatory sufferings the *end*, not the mere *incidents* of his incarnation and sojourn on earth. By his *stripes* we are healed. Hence "the cross of Christ," "the blood of Christ," and other expressions of like import, are frequently employed as symbols of his whole expiatory work. In but two or three instances is his obedience thus employed; and when it is, the term obedience is used in the wide sense we have indicated. Hence, also, the ordinances of the gospel point directly to this transaction, significantly intimating that it is to Calvary that the eye of christian faith must be directed, if it would behold "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."

Had Jesus merely assumed the legal relations of an innocent being under law, and in this relation rendered a perfect obedience to all its precepts, we cannot conceive that this would have possessed any merit which could be available as a ground of justification for the sinner. The example of his innocence and virtue might perhaps have aided the innocent in attaining to a higher virtue. Or were there any such thing as negative moral character, the absence of virtue without the presence of guilt, such obedience might atone for the deficiency. But we cannot see how it could be made a satisfaction for sin. For the sinner, by transgression has come to sustain new relations to the law. The law has a new aspect towards him, and new claims upon him. It demands now, not simply obedience, but the suffering of its penalty. Hence, he who comes as the sinner's representative and substitute, to make

reconciliation for iniquity and bring in an everlasting righteousness by which he may be justified, must, as it seems to us, come into these new relations, and take upon him these new responsibilities. And this, it seems to us, most strikingly accords with the Bible representation of the subject. "He was made in the likeness of *sinful* flesh ; was made sin for us, and bore our sins in his own body on the tree ;" that is, as we understand it, he assumed the legal relations of the sinner, and though innocent, by suffering and dying as a malefactor made expiation for human guilt. The lowest view we can possibly take of the atoning work of Christ seems to demand this. If its design was merely to honor and magnify the law, the suffering of its penalty was as essential to show the righteousness of its sanctions, as obedience to its precepts was to demonstrate the reasonableness of its requirements. But if all this is included under the term obedience, — as we think we have shown that it is as used in Scripture, and our author evidently uses it in the same sense, — then we cannot see as anything more was necessary. Having performed the whole work the Father had given him to do, nothing more remained but to ascend to the right hand of his Father, and await the results that were destined to follow from his expiatory life and sufferings.

But this, it must be remembered, is but one aspect of the work of the Messiah. Though understood in this comprehensive sense it may contain the truth and the whole truth, and though, as we have remarked, there may be advantages in viewing a truth from different points of vision, yet if we were to present this subject in but one aspect we should not select this as the most favorable one. Our objection to it is that it makes that feature most prominent which the Bible makes a subordinate one, and throws that into the background which the Scriptures make most prominent. No one, I think, can read the Bible attentively, with this object in view, without being impressed with the fact that the sacrifice of Christ is ever made the leading feature in his atoning work. How often do you meet with these expressions, "the blood of Christ," "the cross of Christ," "the offering up of Christ," "the blood of the cross," and many others, all pointing to Jesus as a sacrificial victim offered up on the altar of divine justice to atone for human guilt. In some three or four instances alone, we think, is it presented in the light of obedience. Now, though an

artist in painting a group should draw out the features of each individual with lifelike accuracy, yet if in his grouping he should place the leading character in the background, and a subordinate one in the most conspicuous place, the painting as a whole would strike us as strangely out of proportion. We should all gaze with strange sensations on a painting of Christ and the Apostles, in which Matthew or Philip was made to stand out on the canvas as the leading character in the picture, and Jesus was thrown back into the shade. We do not say that this representation of the work of the Messiah is as much out of proportion as that would be, though we confess that it has impressed our minds in a similar manner. What the Bible had taught us to look for standing out with distinctness and prominence as the leading feature in his work, we find but dimly traced, and that as subordinate to another idea upon which the Bible scarcely dwells at all. The author evidently himself felt this discrepancy when he penned the note we have already quoted. We could wish that it had been more completely remedied.

We do not, however, by this mean to imply a doubt whether Dr. Wayland fully recognizes the work of Christ in this other aspect, or that in viewing it in this light he enters less fully into the depth of its import. More explicitness on this point was necessary, only to guard those from misapprehension who will read only this volume. And even such can scarcely be misled, if they weigh well the import of the note to which we have referred. In this note there is one short sentence that contains more sound theology than many whole systems of divinity. It is this: "No view of any subject of revelation can be correct if it do not allow the full and obvious meaning of every class of passages which treat upon that subject." Let a man adhere strictly to this principle and he can never swerve very far from the line of truth. He can never reject fundamental truth, nor embrace radical error. It is when men allow their theories to furnish their rules of Biblical interpretation, instead of the plain declarations of Scripture furnishing the basis of their theories, that truth is sacrificed. In the hands of such interpreters the Bible becomes a plastic thing, ready to be moulded into any form they choose to give it. Its declarations are verities, to be received and embraced with implicit faith, or they are mere figures of speech, tropes and symbols, designed to teach just what they wish to have them

teach. But allow to every class of passages their full and obvious import, and you have something higher and more authoritative than theories. You have the truth as it is in Jesus traced in all its outlines by the hand of infinite wisdom. In accordance with this view the author says: "In treating of the work of Christ, the Scriptures seem to me to develop two ideas — the one, the obedience of Christ to the law; the other, the offering up of himself as a sacrifice for sin." This aspect of his work is more fully developed in a discourse published in 1833 on "The moral efficacy of the doctrine of the Atonement." He says:

"The remedy, then, for our hopeless case is, that *God has sent his Son, in the likeness of sinful human nature, as an offering for sin.*

"It is here proper to remark an important distinction in the scriptural representations of this subject. The Bible, if I have not mistaken its meaning, speaks of the sacrifice of Christ as designed to have a two-fold effect. First, it is revealed to us as a propitiation, or as that which renders it consistent with justice that God should be propitious to sinners; as that which removes the obstacles which, on the part of Divine holiness, existed to our pardon. In this view, Christ is spoken of as 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,' as 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' as 'He who died for our sins,' and 'He by whose stripes we are healed.' But I think that the offering up of Christ is also presented in another light, namely, as having special reference, not to God, but to man; and as distinctly adapted to transform man into new obedience."

And here the author proceeds to develop the moral influence of the sacrifice of Christ to transform man's moral nature. Again he says: —

"From what has been said, I think it must be already obvious that all this change in the nature of our relations with God; all this transition from a state of hopeless condemnation, to a state in which reconciliation with God is full, free and abundant, all this possibility of pardon and sanctification, comes through the death, sufferings and mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have mentioned the condition in which the Bible represents us to be, considered simply in relation to the law. Now, the race of man either is in this state of helpless sin and condemnation, or it is not. If it be, then there is no hope for any of our race, and nothing awaits us but the blackness of darkness forever. But if the race of man be not in this state of helpless condemnation, if there be any way of salvation for us which does not depend upon the perfection of our own righteousness, whence has arisen the change? The attributes of God have not faltered. The law of God has not been abrogated. The character of sin has not changed. No other event but the sacrifice of Christ has occurred, which could have affected our relations with God. All things else remain as they were

from the beginning. Here then is the only hope of ruined, lost man. If God have not sent his Son as a sin offering, the condition of our race is utterly and absolutely hopeless. But it is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. God hath set forth Christ Jesus to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness (clemency) in the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

In another discourse on "The preaching of Christ crucified," he says:—

"Now, we do believe that the New Testament does declare, and that explicitly, and not by inference, the identical truths which are comprised under the terms, Christ crucified. We suppose them not only to be revealed in so many words, but to be interwoven with every other revealed doctrine. We perceive the whole system of revealed religion tinged with the idea of an expiatory sacrifice for sin, and incapable of being sustained without it. We also suppose it to be revealed, that the whole of the Mosaic economy was merely a series of rites instituted to teach, by symbols, this grand truth which the New Testament teaches by language. Such is our belief; and we are willing to submit it to the decisions of fair, honest, rigid, searching, thorough-going criticism, and, as we said before, we are willing to abide the issue. Entertaining these views, and supposing them to be sustained by such authority, it may well be supposed that we feel obliged to preach Christ crucified; whatever objections drawn from the preconceived notions of men are urged to the contrary notwithstanding."

These quotations show the author's views of the work of the Messiah when viewed in the light of a sacrifice for sin. These are not, however, as we conceive, different parts of his work, but the same work seen in different aspects. Each includes the other. His whole life was a sacrifice, as well as his whole sacrifice an act of obedience. On this point there is a passage in Vinet, so pertinent and truthful that we transcribe it.

"Not the mere death of Christ accomplishes our salvation. The author of our salvation is Jesus Christ, as a whole, and therefore St. Paul, after having said we are saved by the *blood of the cross*, justly adds by him. It is not by the mere sufferings endured between Gethsemane and Calvary, that Jesus Christ saves us, but by all the sufferings of his life that constituted throughout one entire passion. For he was delivered for our offences as soon as he opened his eyes to the pale light of our sun, long before he was subjected to the contradiction of sinners. In bearing our body of sin, he bore his cross. It was not merely by the sufferings of his life, but by his whole life. His work forms an indivisible whole; he could not save us without suffering and dying, but

he did not accomplish his work merely by his sufferings and death. He accomplished it by all that he was, and by all that he performed, by his actions, and by his words; by what he did, and what he suffered, by his life, and by his death."

There are other sermons in the volume, that we intended to notice, but we have already transcended the limits we had proposed to ourselves in this article. We close, therefore, by commending the work especially to our brethren in the ministry. It will repay more than a cursory perusal. It contains food for thought; it deserves to be studied, and the views of truth it presents, fully weighed. And he who will do himself and the volume the justice to give it a thorough examination, will find himself richly repaid, in the clearer and more enlarged conceptions of divine truth he will thus acquire.

ARTICLE VI.

The Pre-Adamite Earth; and Man Primeval: Contributions to Theological Science. By JOHN HARRIS, D.D. President of Cheshunt College, and Author of the "Great Teacher," "The Great Commission," "Mammon," etc.

WHAT a sensation was created, a few years, since by the Panorama of the Mississippi River. The author had dared to take a mighty stride in advance of the great world. Three miles of painting, presenting a lifelike view of one of the grandest rivers of the earth, was a sight worth beholding. But the series of volumes projected and partially executed by Dr. Harris, unfold a far bolder and more gigantic conception. It is a panorama of an immeasurably nobler stream than the "Father of waters," and passing through a region inconceivably more sublime and more ravishingly beautiful than the vast western valley. It proposes to exhibit no less than the mighty ever onward flowing flood of hoary time, from the immensely remote period when the Deity unsealed the spring, down to that unknown future, when the waters will be lost in the eternal ocean. The execution, so far, is in good keeping with the grandeur of the plan.

We had repeatedly, before these volumes were written, crossed the swelling tide under the guidance of skilful navigators; and as often as we passed over and gazed intently up and down the stream we became conscious of intellectual and moral improvement. Now under a new captain, who had made a very extensive and judicious use of the experiences of former renowned commanders, we launched into the channel far up the stream, as near the spring as we could safely approach, and thence drifted with the tide many and many a league, and noted carefully on either hand, as we descended, the shores and headlands, now bold and mantled in awful darkness, now exquisitely beautiful and bathed in the mild radiance of a serene heaven, and now exhibiting these extremes in all possible variety of combinations. The launch and the several subsequent grand stations, or great bends in the stream, were overwhelmingly impressive. The scenery was, indeed, often familiar. But owing to our sailing in a different direction, we saw all things in a new light and in new relations. It was one of the happiest and most fruitful voyages we ever made. Our commander was ever extremely fortunate in his selection of such parts of the channel as afforded the most comprehensive views. The weather also was very agreeable. The sky in the regions through which we passed is usually very murky. But now you might have supposed that there was no atmosphere at all, did you not feel the renovated blood flowing into every part with more than its wonted vigor. When we came into those departments over which darkness had settled down for ages, it was astonishing to witness the power and energy of our guide. In those provinces of obscurity and "*chimeras dire*," he said, Let there be light; and light was.

The reader may be pleased to know our sober opinion of the author. This much we can assure him at present, that when he shall have gone to the stars — but may the great Master grant that that event may be many years hence — he will shine in the same constellation with Chalmers, Hall, and Foster, and coming generations will admire the broadness and brilliancy of his disk.

We confess that we took up these volumes with no very sanguine expectations. Though we were much delighted with the glowing and burning eloquence of his "*Great Commission*," and were much gratified with the skill manifested in

reducing great truths into their primary elements, and in concentrating the rays from different but related truths into one bright and burning focus, yet we expected that he would be distinguished chiefly as a rhetorician. His style seemed too little classical, too ambitious, and too much encumbered with words, to answer the purposes of philosophy. Therefore the second volume of the series had been some time published before we felt any curiosity to examine the work. Indeed we commenced the perusal with feelings prepared to dislike it. The titles of the volumes struck us as whimsical, and conveyed to our mind no intelligent notion of their character. Whether "*The Pre-Adamite Earth*," was an epic, or a romance, or a truthful treatise on the geography and geology of Utopia, we could not tell. When "*Man Primeval*" made its appearance our confusion became worse confounded. Who could this hero be? was he one of Robinson Crusoe's family? or was he the Columbus of olden times, who discovered the "*Pre-Adamite Earth*?" A good brother (R. H. N.) had compassion on our perplexity and presented us with the volumes, that we might see with our own eyes these prodigies of our time. For these tokens of brotherly kindness we shall ever feel grateful to him; for we have seldom read any books with more pleasure and profit.

The author gives the most pleasing evidence that since he first became favorably known to the public, he has been a most diligent and successful student. His own language in reference to the works of God may be applied in a twofold sense to himself. The past is brought forward, and there is progression. Those traits of character which had given him so wide a popularity in his former works reappear in the present, and reappear too in a more highly developed state. There is also progression. Since we first made our acquaintance with him, he has held close and protracted communion with the master spirits of this and former ages. His reading has been extensive. In all those departments of knowledge which he has laid under contribution in the execution of this work, he has thoroughly informed himself what had already been accomplished by the best authors. He has gained much strength by such communion. When, therefore, we use the "*past*" as comprehending not only his own history, but whatever had been done by the ablest men, in these volumes "*the past is brought forward.*" The results of what had

been accomplished by the students of nature to elucidate the doctrines here discussed, are most happily brought to bear on the subject under consideration; and these results are brought forward, not in a crude mass, but in a well digested state, and ever bearing the obvious impress of the author's own mind.

There is progression also. These volumes are not so much paper and ink added to our libraries, but they contain a real addition to our stock of knowledge. We do not now wonder that the titles of the volumes should not suggest to us any intelligible idea of their nature. There is not, as we are aware, any one department in literature to which they belong. They are unlike all other books that we have seen. We do not mean to say that they teach any new system of philosophy, or theology. Their novelty is more in their plan than in their subject-matter. The scheme commends itself to us as eminently rational. It furnishes the theological student with a new point of vision, and a point, too, which commands the best view of the scene which he wishes to examine.

In comparison with all that had been done before in the same departments of knowledge, the decided "progression" in this work may be observed in the following particulars:—

First, several of the great doctrines of moral and religious philosophy are more satisfactorily expounded than we have ever seen in other works. We do not expect that now the diversities of opinion respecting them will cease, but those individuals who will faithfully study these volumes — whether they agree with the author or not — will have a more distinct conception of such truths. The author's analytical power is of a very high order.

Secondly, the relations of truths are more fully and impressively brought out than we have ever before witnessed. We do not pretend that the author in point of intellect excels all his predecessors. But in the present state of the sciences, such a work as this — if done by a thoroughly competent person — can now be executed better than at any former period. The author, without being himself strictly a scientific man, has made himself more familiar with the natural sciences — has to a greater extent made them his own, than any theologian with whom we are acquainted. The plan he has adopted enables him to avail himself fully of the combined light which the various revelations that God has made of him-

self, sheds upon his subject. The consequence is, that he leads us down deeper, and lays more bare the massive foundations of the everlasting hills, and guides us up to loftier summits, whence to the far receding horizon we can trace with unwonted distinctness the principal mountain chains, as well as the intervening valleys. The chief excellency of the work consists in the comprehensiveness of its views. The value of truth is enhanced many fold by a lucid exposition of its various connections. We may greatly admire the finished workmanship of wheels, levers, &c., when lying about in confusion. But what is the effect of the several parts taken separately, compared with that of the entire machine in operation?

Thirdly, as might be expected from the rich endowments of the author's mind, the newness and excellency of his plan, and his thorough acquaintance with the sciences in their present advanced state, there are some new things in these books. Whether they are new to the world is more than we can tell. All that we can say is, we have never met with them before. As examples of this kind we would particularly mention the doctrine of Mediation and the original constitution and condition of man.

Fourthly, these volumes combine, to a greater extent than any other work with which we are acquainted, these three elements of greatness — intellect, imagination, and religion. In the first two we do not deem the author equal to John Foster, but he is more learned and hopeful. The work is as eminently adapted to nourish healthful moral and religious feelings, as it is to enlighten the understanding. The latter half of "*Man Primeval*" awakened within us strong and serious reflections. So great and glorious did these volumes exhibit the Lord God in his attributes of power, wisdom, goodness and holiness, that we felt exceedingly humbled, because we understood so little of these perfections before. We have read with much satisfaction the discourses of Charnock and of other theologians on the divine attributes. But these authors leave the most impressive illustrations of these perfections in the hands of those philosophers, who, with every show of humility, are laboring to compliment the Deity out of the universe. Dr. Dick has done much toward the elucidation of the natural perfections of God. But while Dr. Harris's method includes that of Dr. Dick, it makes it subsidiary to a higher and more comprehensive principle. The great-

ness of the divine resources are seen chiefly, not in the extent of the creation, but in its continuous and never-ending progressiveness.

The final object of God in all his works is better stated in these volumes than we have seen it done before in any theological work. While the author agrees with many of his predecessors that God does everything for his own glory, he so explains that doctrine as wholly to free it from the imputation of selfishness. As generally explained, it is made justly liable to such an objection. We felt, also, more sensibly than ever before, the entire consistency of the greatness of God with the greatness of man. It has been too much the fashion in some quarters to exalt the Deity by showing up the nothingness of his masterpiece. No reader can duly reflect on his nature, relations and destiny, as expounded in these volumes, without feeling more sensibly than ever the weight of his moral responsibility, the inconceivable evil of sin, and the immensity of the loss, should man — endowed with such a constitution and being the individual for whom the great books of Creation, Providence and Revelation were made — miss of that higher world, where, in the clearest light and in the absence of all hinderances from within and from without, he may forevermore study those pages, and soar on the flame of intelligence and devotion up to the great source of being, feeling constantly that he is becoming to himself a grander revelation of the Deity.

In commending this work we do not wish to be understood to adopt all the author's views, or that in all cases we regard his reasoning as sound and conclusive. But we have not discovered much, nor anything very serious, from which we are constrained to dissent. The freedom and earnestness of inquiry, and the great reverence for God, for truth, and for duty, everywhere apparent, cannot be too highly commended. The time, we are confident, is not far distant, when few theologians and moralists will be willing to confess that they have not read these books.

But they never will become popular; for they are not books that one can run through at a sitting. They cannot be read at odd hours, and for the sake of relaxation. In order to be understood they must be very deliberately and repeatedly read, and that when the mind is least encumbered and most elastic. We ardently wish that all the ministers of Christ

could and would do this. It would quicken their spirits, elevate and greatly enlarge their theological views, and strengthen their endeavors to be subservient to the grand scheme of the Deity in the creation and government of the universe. But we would not conceal the fact that these books contain no milk for babes. There is nothing here but the most concentrated food for persons of mature age — those who have strong and well-disciplined minds. Let the individual who reads these books as they should be read, understands them and profits by them, be assured that he belongs to nature's aristocracy. On the other hand, let the theologian, who thinks that he has not sufficient metaphysical acumen and patience to master these books, know assuredly that he is wholly incompetent to interpret the gospel of John and the epistles to the Romans, Galatians and Hebrews. As far as he is concerned it would be as well if Paul had never been born. He cannot unravel the logic, nor have any sympathy with the loftiness and wide generalization of the great apostle to the Gentiles. Brother ministers, we would earnestly advise you all to stand up and stretch yourselves by the side of this muscular and tall Englishman, that you may know your own stature.

Should any one be persuaded by our recommendation to read these books, we would advise him to commence with the "Pre-Adamite Earth." For certain reasons we read "Man Primeval," first. We inferred from the author's preface to the "Pre-Adamite Earth," that we might read them in any order we pleased. "The present volume," says he, "is intended to be the first of a short series of treatises — each complete in itself." This is repeated in the preface to "Man Primeval." Meeting with such a declaration at the very opening of the first volume, and finding it repeated at the beginning of the second, who could have imagined that it was necessary to observe any particular order in the examination of them? But the consequence of our too ready faith was, that we read the volume half through before we understood what the author was aiming at. What a singular discourse on holiness, thought we, is this first chapter. The caption of the second: "The past brought forward," was to us a Delphic oracle. And as to the third, "Progression," we wondered he had not named it "Quadratics." But when we read the first volume, the mysteries were all cleared up. We

would with all respect suggest to the author the propriety of reconsidering that statement. We cannot well conceive how one volume can depend more intimately on another than the second of this series does on the first. The first volume is complete in itself; the first and second are complete in themselves. But we might as truly say of the third, fourth, or fifth part in volume first, that it is complete in itself, as to say that "Man Primeval" is complete in itself.

The scheme of the author is this: that the design of God in all his works is to reveal his own self-sufficiency. The revelation in order to be adequate must be on an unlimited scale. But from the very nature of the case creation cannot be infinite in extent and perfection. No medium is conceivable whereby a complete illustration may be at once given of almighty power, of wisdom, exhaustless in its resources, of boundless benevolence, of spotless and necessary holiness. The infinite can be properly revealed only through an infinite medium. Therefore the manifestation must go on to all infinity. It must begin in great simplicity, and go on without a pause, ever widening, ever arriving at new and more important crises which on the part of God must be constantly and fully met. It is effected by thus ever widening the manifestation, by creating new and greater difficulties only to be overcome and turned into a means for the advancement of his own purpose, by presenting occasions for the introduction of higher and more comprehensive principles.

The first and second parts of the "Pre-Adamite Earth," contain the statement and exposition of the great scheme of the Divinity, as apprehended by the author. The remaining three parts illustrate the scheme during the three grand epochs in the history of this earth, previous to the creation of man. The first of these periods, the creation and disposition of inorganic matter, reveals an intelligent omnipotence. The second organic life, or the introduction and spread of vegetables, discloses an almighty omniscience. During the third period, sentient existence, power and wisdom — the manifestation of which was the object of the preceding stages, — now become subordinate to the revelation of goodness. Thus every subsequent era of the manifestation includes all the purposes of the preceding ones, carries them onward, while it superadds another principle which discloses a deeper mystery in the Divine Being.

"The Pre-Adamite Earth" traces the divine manifestation through three different economies, and down to the very eve of the fourth. The temple is all finished, but the worshipper has not yet arrived. Impressed with the length and greatness of the preparation, the author casts his eye forward, and in his soliloquizing respecting the probable character of the next great event, he rises into the lofty and fiery eloquence of Isaiah. Did our limits admit we would gladly transcribe the whole passage; but in order to be felt in all its beauty it must be read in its connections.

"Man Primeval" opens with an exposition of the design of the new dispensation — the manifestation of the divine holiness. This period also carries forward whatever had already been begun. In order to show that the Adamic creation illustrates the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Deity, the author, availing himself of all the light of geology and revelation, gives an exceedingly fine, and to us entirely satisfactory explanation of that great and last organic change. No matter is supposed to have been brought into existence at that time, and the change is supposed to have been limited. Some of the opening grandeur of this new period the author thus describes.

"Thus far we have only verified the truth of the scriptural declaration concerning man, 'that his foundation is in the dust,' for we have merely unearthed and looked at that foundation. The towering and temple-like superstructure is yet to engage our attention. But could we have looked on that foundation, even before it began to be built on, and to receive its mysterious additions, and could we have taken a comprehensive survey of the preparations and purposes which it implied, how profound the emotions which must have filled our breasts! To receive the foundations of a temple, the ground has often to be prepared — or, as it is technically called, to be *made* — at an immense expenditure of time and labor; but here is a basis laid, for which 'the foundations of the earth' themselves had been laid — for which the earth itself had been, literally, made. Nations have quarrelled for the mere sketches and outlines of the human figure by some of the masters of design: the very fragments of the marble block from which one of the masterpieces of ancient sculpture was hewn, would be deemed a treasure for royalty; but here is the divine model of all their copies — the original of human beauty — fresh from the hand of the infinite Designer. 'The dust of antiquity,' when it does not cover what ought to be exposed, imparts sacredness and value to the objects on which it rests; here dust of dateless antiquity, after having passed through numberless combinations, is taken and moulded into a human form. Some of the members of that form had been in the scheme of animal organization unknown ages before the earth was

prepared for man or suited to his constitution; possibly, the earth of which they are moulded has been already in all their animal types; but in his form they have at length attained a development which, guided by reason, will make him the sovereign of the animal kingdom. And even earlier still, before time began, there was 'a book'—an eternal plan—in which 'all his members were sketched, when as yet there was none of them.' And how greatly would it have added to the interest of the spectacle could we have imagined all the relations of that new-made organization to the physical elements which encompassed it; or have foreseen that when that Pharos, prostrate on the earth, should be erected, and lighted up with an intelligence within, it would stand, the centre of the material universe, with lines of relationship drawn to it from every part of the vast circumference! What, then, must our emotions have been, could we have looked on that frame, so 'fearfully and wonderfully made,' with a prophetic eye, and have caught a glimpse of its subsequent history!"

Its superiority over the preceding ones is thus stated:

If the perceived objective discloses our distinction from, yet relation to, things without; and if, under the eye of reflection, the subjective affirms the relation of external things among themselves, surely the percipient and reflective power, itself and in itself, will not be barren of information. If the mind, regarded simply as the subject of sensation, and as capable of dealing with its sensations, discloses much, considered as itself an objective addition to creation, it may surely be expected to disclose more. The highest being, objectively considered, may be expected constitutionally to imply or reveal the highest relations. If the external universe be a wondrous volume, though unconscious of one of all the unnumbered ideas of which it is the expression, surely the mind which views every object as a letter, every fact resulting from a combination of these objects as a word, and every natural collocation of such words as a sentence significant of some lofty truth, must itself be more wonderful and instructive still. And if those acts of the mind by which it recognizes the letters, and the words, and the relation of the words to each other, be wonderful, more wonderful must that power of the mind be which interprets the sentence, and which derives from itself, through its union with the objective, the ideas which the Maker of both intended to convey."

"How divine the arrangement by which the counterpart of every idea involved or implied in the external world shall exist potentially in the human mind! Without these, the assumed end of the objective would fail; for if that end be to reveal the infinite and eternal in God, the attainment of that end depends on the powers or susceptibilities which the finite subjective shall bring to it. If the ancient Aristotelean maxim—'pregnant with systems'—be admitted, that 'there is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the sense,' how important the addition made by Leibnitz, 'except the intellect itself,' for in that mental constitution must be potentially involved, not only all that the sense is capable of evolving, but the power of affirming the ultimate relations of both to God; otherwise they will not glorify

Him. And if it be true that the mind be a blank apart from the external creation, yet how elaborately must that apparent blank be prepared, when, by simply bringing it into the light and warmth of the objective, it glows with colors not of earth, and shows that from the first it had been written over with a secret writing by the hand of God. So that if a being of another race, capable of interpreting creation, were to make creation, mental and material, his study, after all that he had learned from material objects, and from the effects of these objects on the human mind in sensation, he would expect to learn more from the study of the mind itself — of the mind primitive and potential — than from all creation besides."

We should be very happy to follow the author through the entire volume. But the space allotted us will not admit of further remarks. We shall only add that we have read the book through twice with great interest. The advantages of the author's plan become more apparent as he advances, and as the theme opens with greater grandeur, the power and eloquence of the author rise with it.

ARTICLE VII.

EMBARKATION OF MESSRS. JUDSON AND NEWELL, FEB. 18, 1812.

[We have received the following examination of the *Strictures* of Rev. S. M. Worcester, from one who was, at the time referred to, a resident in Salem, and who, being himself connected with a congregational society, can have no party or sectarian motive in the remarks he makes. We give it therefore to our readers as the impressions received by a candid impartial individual, from reading the statements of Dr. Judson and the *strictures* upon them. ED.]

WE have read the "*Strictures*," by Rev. S. M. Worcester, on the "*Judson Offering*" and the Review of "*The Missionary character of Dr. Judson*," with some care, and are unable to avoid the conclusion that these elaborate *strictures* were uncalled for and unnecessary. One or two expressions in the "*Review*" and by Dr. Dowling, should have been differently stated, as they are susceptible of a construction, by those unacquainted with the period to which they refer, not intended by the writers. But still there was nothing which, when taken in connection with the general scope and object of Dr. Judson and his reviewers, could affect the

distinguished reputation of the late Rev. Dr. Worcester. He needed no vindication. And the whole spirit and manner, both of the "Offering" and "Review," forbid the supposition that any injurious imputation was intended or desired. There is nothing in them savoring of sect or party; all is liberal and kind, not a word indicating a wish to wound the feelings or reputation of any one. We therefore regret the appearance of these "Strictures," because, while they can subserve no valuable purpose, they are adapted to bring reproach on the sacred cause of missions and to impeach directly the integrity of Dr. Judson.

If, however, some explanation or correction was thought needful to prevent or remove any erroneous impressions which the few unguarded expressions might possibly make on the public mind, this, certainly, no one would more readily approve than Dr. Judson and his reviewers. But the writer of the "Strictures" has done much more than this—much more, it seems to us, than was necessary to his avowed purpose,—he has occupied twenty pages in magnifying a few errors, if errors they were, and in proving many facts which have no relation to the question at issue, and which no one doubted. So that the effect on the mind of the reader is that of an attack on Dr. Judson and his reviewers, rather than a correction of a few remarks which were supposed to have an unfavorable bearing on the character of the late Dr. Worcester. We trust, therefore, that an examination of the merits of this case will not be considered entirely out of place at this time.

It is obvious that the main object of Dr. Judson, and that also of his reviewers, was, to contrast the manifestations of public opinion and feeling at the present time, with that which prevailed in 1812, for the purpose of showing that modern missions was not a failure. Whether there was any just ground for this comparison is the leading question in this controversy; and it is our purpose to insist on the accuracy of Dr. Judson's representation.

In order fully to understand this matter, it is necessary to advert to the state of religious feeling and opinion, at the time Dr. Judson left his native country as missionary to the heathen. At that time Unitarian sentiments, or liberal views as they are called on religious subjects, were the controlling opinions in a large section of Massachusetts. In Boston there was scarcely

one congregational minister who inculcated the doctrines now denominated orthodox. The prejudice against these doctrines was strong, and in some cases violent. Who that lived at the time does not recollect, that when Park Street Church was established, and Dr. Griffin preached there, they were both the objects of vulgar jest and ridicule? Men of cultivated intellects, almost universally, looked upon these views of religion with aversion and hostility. Dr. Codman of Dorchester was prevented by violence from entering his own pulpit on the Sabbath, by a part of his society, on account of his orthodox preaching; and he was able to keep his place only by purchasing the pews of all the liberal members of his congregation. Salem and Beverly were not unlike Boston in this respect; opposition to orthodox opinions and preaching was the popular and prevailing feeling with the mass of the people; and almost the whole weight of property and fashion and cultivated taste, was on the side of those who held to liberal opinions. A few individuals only of elevated and cultivated minds could be found united with the orthodox societies. Orthodox ministers were looked upon as narrow minded and bigoted, especially that portion of them who were the most earnest and explicit in the avowal of their distinctive opinions; and these last were the men who originated foreign missions, and through whose energetic efforts the first missionaries were sent forth from this country. For the general accuracy of this statement we venture to appeal to the Rev. Mr. P., one of the witnesses adduced in this case; we would also refer to a recent work entitled "Pages from the Ecclesiastical History of New England." Also to "Belsham's account of American Unitarianism," and the Review of that work in the *Panoplist*, and also to "Park Street Lectures," by Dr. Griffin.

Our object in this representation is not to reproach any class of the community, nor to suggest which party was in fault for the prevailing feeling — probably neither could justly plead entire exemption from blame — but by this statement it is our purpose to show why it was that the public mind was so opposed to foreign missions, at the time Dr. Judson embarked. In looking back, we find the fact of this opposition in accordance with what might have been expected at that period. Indeed, the writer of "Strictures" has himself supplied sufficient proof to satisfy any one. Professor Emerson says,

"While men were only *speculating* on the scheme, Rev. Mr. Emerson, of Beverly, had begun to act." Rev. Mr. P. speaks of "the *enemies* of orthodoxy, and of *Missions*." Augustine Heard, Esq., states, "I was more or less among people who were not *particularly favorable to Foreign Missions* — thinking that they would produce *very little if any good*." "They seemed to be viewed with admiration for their courageous and *self-sacrificing* feelings." And the writer is himself compelled to state, that, "when but ten years had passed, *the progress had been so great*, that, in a review of God's providence towards the American Board, the *commencement of operations* appeared as 'a day of small things.'"

We consider the writer of the "Strictures" peculiarly unfortunate in the position he occupies in this controversy. Like the man in a boat, who looks one way and rows another, so he reasons in a direction the opposite of his proposed object. In the contrast of Dr. Judson, of the time when he engaged as a missionary with the present time, the facts assumed are, that then but few manifested an interest in the cause, and that the enterprise of Foreign Missions was in opposition to prevailing public opinion; and his argument is most favorable to the christian character and far-seeing mind of the late Dr. Worcester and others, who projected it, and through whose perseverance the many obstacles in the way were met and overcome. Now, according to the writer of the "Strictures," there is no ground for this representation, and, of course, so far as he succeeds in his reply to Dr. Judson, just so far he subtracts from the merit of Dr. Worcester and others, in all they did in the cause; for it is scarcely necessary to remark, that if the public voice was then quite as favorable to foreign missions as it is at the present time, there was little or no merit on the part of those who then engaged in it. The cause is now commended by all classes of christians. Even some of the Unitarians, at their recent interesting meetings in Boston, speak of it as worthy of the favor of all who bear the christian name. No special credit, therefore, is due to those who lend their influence to promote this cause. The avowed object of the writer of the "Strictures" is to vindicate the fair fame of his father, in relation to foreign missions; but his argument is a virtual denial of the chief ground which can sustain the distinguished reputation of his father in this respect.

It is *our* business, therefore, to do justice to the honored memory of the late Dr. Worcester, and to rescue it from the necessary effect of these "Strictures."

As Dr. Dowling and the reviewer of the missionary life of Dr. Judson, depended entirely upon the address of the latter at the Cannon Street Church, New York, for their remarks, which were the occasion of the "Strictures" before us, and as the principal facts in that address are pronounced "utterly unfounded," "unaccountable misrepresentations," and "without a shred of reality," we shall examine its statements somewhat critically.

The first fact stated is, that "Thirty-three years ago there was but very little interest felt by christians in this land for the perishing heathen." Is this statement "utterly unfounded?" Does not the writer of the "Strictures" admit that it was "a day of small things," compared only with the short subsequent period of ten years? The fact requires no further proof.

2. The second statement is in these words. "When your missionaries left your shores, very few were willing to be known as approving of their enterprise." The evidence already adduced bears directly on this point, nor is it disproved by anything offered by the writer of the "Strictures." We are aware that Rev. Mr. P. denies, in general language, the correctness of the statement, and, what is not a little remarkable, he includes the "enemies of missions" with those who were its friends. He says that "even with them, the enemies of missions, there was a deep sympathy." But it was a sympathy with the missionaries, and not with the missionary cause. It is not unfrequent that men of kind feelings give their money to help individuals in a cause which they do not approve. No one questions the kindness of the people of Salem, but the Rev. Mr. P. dares not assert, in so many words, that the people of Salem generally, or a majority, thirty-seven years ago, approved of foreign missions; and if he cannot say this, his testimony on this point amounts to nothing. He does, indeed, say that the town of Salem was all alive in their "*admiration*" of the undertaking, but he does not say it was an admiration expressive of approval of missions. No, it was an "admiration" that was expressive of their wonder and astonishment; it expressed, no doubt, emotions not dissimilar to those experienced by an European when

he witnesses a suttee in Hindostan. Mr. Heard employs the same word, and in a connection that can mislead no one. He says the missionaries "seemed to be viewed with *admiration* for their courageous and *self-sacrificing* feelings." Here we have the true state of the case; and it perfectly agrees with our own recollections of the period referred to.

3. The third fact is the remark ascribed to the Secretary of the Board:—"Brethren, I have business that demands my attention to-day in a neighboring town; you will therefore have to excuse me from going with you to your vessel." This fact must be received as true, for it cannot be disproved; besides, it is admitted that the Secretary did in fact go out of town. It is only objected that it is doing great injustice to the Secretary to suppose he was ashamed to be seen with the missionaries at their embarkation. But this is not asserted by Dr. Judson; it is only the inference of the reviewer from the fact, as stated by Dr. Judson. And let it be noted that the point made by Dr. Judson in stating the fact, was not that he would complain of the Secretary, but merely this—the effect which the absence of the Secretary had on his own mind when he went on board of the vessel, and also the difference of the public feeling at that time from that which now prevails. Nor is the fact invalidated by the unimportant circumstance, whether it was at breakfast or dinner, the morning he sailed or some other morning, that the Secretary apologized for leaving town. Every one knows that it is common for persons to be certain in their recollection of a leading fact, when, at the same time, they may be mistaken in respect to some minute circumstance connected with it. We will only add here, that we were surprised that the writer of the "Strictures" should have thought it proper to affix the note of exclamation to the words ascribed to the Secretary, as it changes materially the purpose for which the fact was stated. Such liberties are unwarrantable.

4. The next fact is this: "Those young men went silently and alone." The meaning here is obviously this: not that no one went with them, but that no minister, no one of the Board went with them; and that there was no assembling on the shore, as described by Dr. Dowling, and as is common at the present time when missionaries embark. And this is all correct; and it is true to the letter, it seems, that Dr. Judson did in fact go alone. Nor is the fact stated, as we can per-

ceive, in the way of complaint against any one, but is only given to show what must have been the feelings of the first missionaries, on leaving their home and every thing dear on earth, under such circumstances.

5. The last statement we shall notice is this: "And though there was not a minister who was willing to hazard his reputation, by countenancing what was regarded as an enthusiastic enterprise, yet" &c. So far as this statement asserts a fact, its truth is not denied; but so far as it expresses an opinion, as to the reason why no minister was present, other persons who lived at that time, with equal advantages for forming a correct opinion, can judge as well as Dr. Judson. Nothing more was probably intended, than that under the great unpopularity of the undertaking, no minister was willing to incur the risk of meeting the sneers of the low and vulgar, by going with the missionaries to the vessel.

Nor is the supposition of Dr. Judson in any wise extraordinary, that a minister, who should lend his countenance to a missionary by attending him in his embarkation, should be met by "sneers." Thirty-seven years since, the avowal of opinions not in accordance with those generally received *did* require no little moral courage, as not unfrequently it was the occasion, not only of sneers, but of more serious opposition. In one town in the county of Essex, about that time, a Methodist minister, who was the first of his order to visit and preach in the town, was called upon by the selectmen, at the request of the people, and ordered immediately to leave town. In another case in the same county, near the same time, a large collection of persons assembled near the place where the ordinance of baptism by immersion was for the first time administered, firing guns, and otherwise manifesting their scorn and opposition. And even at a period somewhat later, an Orthodox minister, now a distinguished preacher in New York, was horsewhipped in the streets of Salem, for dreaming a temperance dream, which was supposed to have some bearing on a respectable Unitarian family, who for many years had been engaged in the distillery business. Now, then, why should it be considered unreasonable that at the time the first missionaries sailed, it was supposed quite proper for ministers to abstain from a course of action that would be likely to occasion the sneers of the ignorant and vulgar; and this, too, without implying any deficiency of zeal or independence?

And let it be observed that the attendance of the ministers who favored the missionary cause, in the tabernacle, for the religious services at the ordination of the missionaries, where all who attended were serious, religious persons, was a very different thing from passing openly down the streets to the wharf, exposed to the gaze of those, all whose feelings were opposed to the proposed object. The opinion of Dr. Judson does not warrant the criticism * of the writer of the "Strictures" (on page 129), for Dr. Judson could not, without the grossest perversion, be supposed to mean any other responsibility by his suggestion, than attending the missionaries in their embarkation. This and this only was referred to. Thus it is seen that the brief address of Dr. Judson is "wonderfully" in accordance with the truth; and yet the writer of the "Strictures," although he has failed of disproving a single important statement, but rather confirmed, by his own witnesses, the principal statements, has the courage to make the sweeping assertion, that it is "without a shred of reality."

It is true the writer has made a great show of witnesses in reserve, for twice he talks of "one hundred," and, as if this was not sufficiently terrific, he threatens "*five hundred*" more, but does not specify the facts he expects to prove by this prodigious array of witnesses. We are willing to admit that the writer has proved many facts, but then it must be added that they were facts that no one ever doubted; such as, that the late Dr. Worcester was zealously and successfully engaged in the cause of missions — that at the time the missionaries sailed there was much prayer on their behalf, that they received many personal favors from the kind people of Salem, and that some few individuals contributed liberally for their benefit, although they were "enemies of Orthodoxy and of Missions." But none of these facts were called in question, nor referred to, by Dr. Judson. We say, therefore, to the writer of the "Strictures," if he increases his witnesses from "five hundred" to five thousand, it will avail nothing, unless he meets the precise matter at issue. MAINE.

* The criticisms of the writer, on the remark, "not a minister willing to hazard his reputation;" also, another criticism on the same page, touching Dr. Judson's going "alone" to his vessel, are specimens of quibbling that can add nothing to the reputation of a high-minded and ingenuous reviewer.

ARTICLE VIII.

GERMAN NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

THE political disturbances in Germany have begun to work out the results in regard to literary pursuits which one would naturally anticipate. These results are visible in various ways. The number of students at the Universities is greatly diminished. Several of the most important periodicals, both literary and theological, have been discontinued for want of patronage. Scholars are drawn away from learning to politics. Some of the most prominent political leaders were formerly professors in the universities or gymnasia. The catalogues of new publications are meagre beyond all precedent. The press is still active enough, but issues very few works which attest the old-fashioned German learning and diligence. Most of the publications are sermons and pamphlets, discussing the new social, ecclesiastical and political questions, which the progress of revolution has made the order of the day. The book trade, which has usually flourished in Germany when nothing else could, is represented as almost prostrate.

It is remarkable that the three most distinguished leaders of the old rationalist party,—Bretschneider, Röhr, and Wegscheider,—have died very nearly within a year of each other. They had all reached an advanced age, and had quite outlived the peculiar school of theology which they supported. At the commencement of the present century, theirs was the dominant religious party, throughout all Germany; Straussism and its kindred forms of error on the one hand, and a return to the true doctrines of the gospel on the other, have now swept away almost every vestige of it.

The large and valuable libraries of Bretschneider and Jacobs are advertised for sale. The former consists of 7,000 volumes, and the latter of 9,000, containing among them the choicest works in the departments of theological and classical learning. Many of those which belonged to Jacobs, contain copious marginal notes from his own hand, of the nature either of corrections, or ampler illustrations of the original, — notes which render the works to which they are attached almost equal to new editions, and will cause them to be eagerly sought after

by scholars. We observe from the catalogues sent out that the prices of second-hand books in Germany are marked as uncommonly low. There was never a better time for replenishing the libraries of this country with works of this description than the present.

The supplementary numbers (*Hefte*) of the *Conversations-Lexikon*, ninth edition, are appearing rapidly; at the rate, generally, of two or three a month. The latest which we have received is the twentieth, issued in March of this year. Its principal contents are: The Slavi or Slavonic race, i. e., their history, present condition and prospects; — the Socialist Movement and Socialism in England; — Joseph Von Görres; — the Cossacks. Most of the later numbers have been occupied almost entirely with similar topics of contemporary interest. The articles in this work on American subjects are by no means so correct or impartial as they ought to be. In one place, Nova Scotia is spoken of as a part of the United States. Phillips Academy at Andover, is said to have been founded by Franklin. We are told that on the fourth of July, 1826, the elder President Adams was awakened at his residence in Quincy by the ringing of bells and the discharge of cannon in New York. The sketch, as it claims to be of the political character of John Quincy Adams, it is impossible to read without indignation. One of the purest of American statesmen is here held up to the world as a consummately selfish, intriguing, unprincipled man. The grossest calumnies which a partisan press could heap upon him during an excited political canvass, but which no person of information in the country ever believed for a moment, are set down as established matters of fact. It would be easy to write out a formidable list of similar offences against truth and accuracy. It is evident that Mr. Brockhaus, the proprietor, has not secured in every case the services of the best informed or most impartial writers respecting American affairs.

Since the above paragraph was written, two additional *Hefte*, the twenty-first and second, have been received. The main article in these numbers is the *Bewegung von 1848 in Berlin*. The writer sympathizes evidently with the popular movement, but has dealt out too much censure to both parties to be suspected of any intentional unfairness in his statements. The assertion so often made in this country that the rising at

Berlin was instigated by foreigners, is denied as utterly groundless.

Winer has published the eighth *Heft* of his *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, or Bible Dictionary, which completes the entire work. It consists of two volumes, the first pp. 688, the second pp. 778; price eight *Thaler*. The preceding edition, the second, appeared in 1835. Among the changes which distinguish the new edition, it is pleasing to observe the fuller manner in which the labors and views of orthodox men are represented. Their numbers, as well as acknowledged ability and scholarship, at the present time, have secured for them a recognition from their opponents, which it is felt to be neither just nor politic to deny. A different fashion prevailed but a few years ago. In the winter of 1842, Professor Tholuck remarked to the writer that that was the first *semester* in which he had been able to adduce in his lectures the name of Hengstenberg in support of an opinion, without the fear of exciting some open expression of contempt from the students. In the pages of Winer's present work we meet continually with the names of Hengstenberg, Hävernicks, Tholuck, Keil, and others of the same class. Their opinions on controverted points are not only quoted largely, but approved, often in opposition to those of the free-thinking critics.

De Wette has published the sixth edition of his Introduction to the Old Testament. The third edition of his Commentary on the Acts, which appeared last year, is almost a reprint of the second. Bauer's Life of Paul is the only important work affecting this part of the New Testament which the interval between the two editions has produced; and with reference to this work, De Wette says that his readers will not censure him for considering the destructive style of criticism adopted in it, unworthy of notice or refutation. Scholz, Catholic Professor at Bonn, has completed the third part of his *Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften*. We have examined parts first and second. The author has not pursued so rigid a plan, or fortified always his statements so strongly with proofs and references, as might be desired; but he has brought together a great amount of information on the topics discussed, which it is exceedingly convenient to have within reach.

The most important recent contributions to exegesis are the following:—A Commentary on Colossians and Philemon by Meyer—a continuation of his *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar*

on the New Testament. The part containing the epistles to the Thessalonians is under the press.—*Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser*, exposition of the epistle to the Ephesians, by Dr. Rudolph Stier. The author has already furnished ample proof of his ability as an interpreter, in his Commentary on Selection from the Psalms, and especially in his copious work on the Discourses of Christ. His method, which is a combination of the critical and practical, is something unusual among the Germans, but has been received, on the whole, with much favor. To extensive learning and more than ordinary originality of mind, Dr. Stier adds, also, an entire faith in the Scriptures as the inspired word of God. In his *Anzeiger* for 1848, No. 46, Tholuck pronounces this commentary the ablest of Stier's exegetical efforts.—*Commentar über den ersten Brief Pauli an die Korinther*, by T. F. Osiander. This work is reviewed in terms of general commendation in Reuter's *Allgemeines Repertorium* and in Tholuck's *Anzeiger*. The author's views respecting the parties in the church at Corinth, are instanced as worthy of special attention.—*Commentar über den Römerbrief*, by F. A. Philippi, Professor in the university at Breslau. The author's standpoint is decidedly orthodox. He has developed the doctrinal contents of the epistle with unusual fulness. De Wette has honored the work with a somewhat extended notice in a late number of the *Jenaische allgem. Litt. Zeitung*, in which with singular candor he admits the superiority of Philippi's criticisms to those heretofore adopted by himself on several important passages. On the other hand he contends that in some instances where they differ, he is right and Philippi wrong.—*Kritische Untersuchung über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe an die korinthische Gemeinde*, etc., Critical Inquiry respecting the contents of the two epistles of Paul to the Corinthian Church, with reference to the dissensions which prevailed in them. Such an inquiry might seem, at first view, to be an isolated and unimportant one; but if we consider that the apostle has undoubtedly more or less reference throughout these epistles to the dissensions in question and the errors which occasioned them, it is evident that the decision formed on these points must affect the interpretation of a large part of the entire epistles. But have not commentators already settled the inquiry, so as to render the present labor superfluous? This no one surely will affirm, who perceives how, even among the

latest critics, such men as Bauer, Neander, De Wette, and others, all pursue here their own separate way. Has now the author of the present attempt merely increased the number of theories, or has he at last hit upon the true solution? "I am really inclined," says Tholuck in a notice of this work, "to believe the latter." The book then must be worth having.

The work of Wieseler — *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, etc., *Chronology of the Apostolic Age* — pp. 606, 1848, is a production of great merit. Its object is to settle the chronological order of the events in the Acts of the Apostles. It endeavors to ascertain the year, the month, and, to some extent, the day of the several occurrences. A plan so minute leads necessarily to some conclusions of an uncertain nature, but the main positions are well sustained. The author rejects the opinion that the apostle Paul was liberated from the Roman imprisonment mentioned at the close of the Acts. In adjusting the place, in the history of Paul, of the epistles which have been more usually assigned to a second imprisonment, and the interval between the first and a second imprisonment, he follows essentially the system of Hug. Dr. Wieseler has occasion to show, in an appendix, that the apostle Peter unquestionably visited Rome — a fact of no consequence to our one-sided anti-Catholic writers who trouble themselves so much less about the truth than the convenience of an argument. The book contains some exegetical material which is valuable, though the author's interest to make out his case appears to us to have influenced his interpretation of several passages.

We have before us, in advance of the regular time of distribution, (July,) the third *Heft* of the *Studien und Kritiken* of the present year. The principal articles in this number are: 1. Remarks on the Doctrine concerning Sin with reference to the Treatise of J. Müller, by Dr. De Wette. 2. The Testimony of the fourth Evangelist from himself respecting his own person, by K. L. Weitzel. 3. New Testament Lexical Studies and Criticisms, by C. F. Gelpke, Professor in Berne. 4. Exegetical Discussions — first, on Mark 9: 49, 50, by Dr. Bähr, and second, on the Idea of the Holiness of God, by J. M. Rupprecht. 5. Review of Matthäus and Ranke on the Pericopes of the Church-Year, by Ernst Fink. 6. A notice of the larger edition of Muralto's Greek Testament. 7. Thoughts and Observations on the Church in Norway, by C.

Sarwey — an article concluded from the preceding number. The January number of this periodical has an article by Umbreit on the Gospel in the Old Testament, founded on Rom. 1 : 2 ; and one by Hauff on several difficult passages in John. The Biblical articles in the April number are, one by Grimm, Professor at Jena, on the first epistle of John and its relation to the fourth Gospel ; one by R. Nagel, of Bonn, on the Signification of Melchisedek in the epistle to the Hebrews ; another by Professor Stähelin, of Basel, on the Conquest and Division of Palestine by Joshua ; and a fourth by Wächtler on the Parable in Matthew 13 : 45, 46.

From a schedule of the lectures delivered at two or three of the principal German universities during the present summer, we select the following notices. We append to them here and there a remark. 1. Berlin. Hengstenberg lectures on the Kingdom of God under the ancient dispensation, on the book of Job and portions of the Apocalypse ; Vatke on Job, on the smaller Pauline epistles and the History of the Modern Theology ; Nitzsch on Proverbs, with an Introduction to the Jewish Theology, on Homiletics and Christian Ethics ; Neander on the Acts of the Apostles, on Church-History from the Reformation to the present time, and on the first part of the History of Doctrines ; and Twisten on Romans, and on the Immortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Body. The above are the most distinguished names in the Theological Faculty. Nitzsch is the successor of Marheineke, and is well known as a theologian of the Schleiermacher school. He is now much nearer the limit of old age than of youth. It will be observed that Hengstenberg is occupied in part with the study of the Apocalypse. He is understood to be preparing a commentary on that book. He has inserted lately in his *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung*, several articles which authorize us to believe that he will find, if not the direct fulfilment of some of the revelator's predictions, yet, at least, important parallels to such fulfilment in the present commotions of Europe. 2. Halle — Wittenberg. Of the Old Testament books, Hupfeld lectures on Job ; Rödiger and Wichelhaus on the Psalms ; Haarbrücker on Genesis. Of the New Testament books, Tholuck lectures on Matthew, Mark, and Luke ; Niemeyer on Hebrews ; Wichelhaus on the epistle of James. Hupfeld gives instruction, also, on the Structure of the Hebrew Language, together with the Elements of the Chal-

dee Language; and Rödiger on Biblical Archæology, and the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament. The vacancy occasioned by the death of Wegscheider has not yet been filled. 3. Leipzig. Some of the lectures now in the course of delivery here, are: Winer, Explanation of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and Biblical Theology of the New Testament; Harless, Christian Ethics and Explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians; Tuch, Political Antiquities of the Jews, Explanation of Job and the Minor Prophets; Theile, the Gospel of Matthew and General View of the Development of Christian Doctrines; Anger, Historical and Critical Introduction to the Old and New Testaments, and Explanation of the Psalms; and Tischendorf, Synopsis of the Evangelists, the Holy Land in its Biblical Relations and Biblical Palæography. All these men have published important commentaries on books of the Bible, or other theological works, which are well known to scholars. The amount of orthodox influence at Leipzig is greater at the present time than it has been for many years. The appointment of Harless as Professor in the University, and Preacher in one of the city Churches, was an important event. He has not only the reputation of an eminent scholar, but is considered as one of the most eloquent men in the German pulpit at the present day. He is firm in his attachment to the truths of the gospel, unshrinking in his avowal of them, and preaches with a decision and power which have awakened great attention. H.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *Gospel Studies*: By ALEXANDER VINET, D.D., Professor of Theology in Lausanne, Switzerland, Author of "Vital Christianity," etc.; with an Introduction, by ROBERT BAIRD, D.D. New York, published by M. W. Dodd, Brick Church Chapel, opposite City Hall, 1849.

It is with no ordinary degree of pleasure that we announce to our readers the appearance of this volume. To those who have read Mr. Turnbull's translation of "Vital Christianity," by the same distinguished author, no commendation of ours will increase their desire to peruse the volume before us. It is marked by the same general char-

acteristics, strength of thought, clearness of conception, and beauty of diction, while it brings before our minds, almost with unequalled freshness, some of the most important and interesting subjects connected with our christian faith. Dr. Vinet was a man who was able to make his hearers and readers feel with uncommon power the force of truth. Some of his propositions are so original and strong as to startle us at first sight, but if we follow him to the end of his argument, we seldom feel any disposition to question either their truth or propriety. This work will be perused and reperused with fresh interest, and its influence upon our hearts and opinions will be most salutary. We would say to all those who wish to commune with one of the most clear, vigorous, and original minds of this age, you cannot gratify your desire better than by the perusal of this volume.

2. *Republican Christianity, or True Liberty, as exhibited in the life, precepts and early Disciples of the Great Redeemer.* By E. L. MAGOON, Author of "Proverbs for the People," "Living Orators of America," "Orators of the American Revolution." Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 59 Washington Street, 1849.

This is a timely work. To ascertain the true relation of Christianity to civil government, is one of the most important questions of the age. That those politico-religious systems that have assumed the name, and under its guise have tyrannized for ages over the consciences of men are not Christianity, is a truth that is forcing itself more and more on the minds of the thinking and intelligent. It is becoming more and more apparent that Christianity never can become national without losing some of its essential elements, and taking to itself other elements that are repugnant to its very nature. Christianity calls no man Master, but Jesus Christ. It demands for every man an unfettered conscience, amenable in matters of religion to God alone. It demands of every man an obedience to its own supreme dictates that is incompatible with the intervention of any other authority between it and the individual. And the spirituality of its nature is utterly inconsistent with its ever becoming the subject of human legislation. Till piety of heart can be regulated by law — till the Holy Spirit of God can be made to obey the mandates of kings and hierarchs, the union of church and state will ever be a moral absurdity. And all experience has proved its corrupting and degrading influence upon both the church and the state. The union has constituted a "mystery of iniquity," reeking with pollution, and drunk with the blood of martyrs. At such a time as the present, when thrones are crumbling, and hierarchies are becoming dissolved, and all the tendencies of the age are towards civil and religious liberty, we hail with satisfaction the appearance of any work that can throw any guiding light upon this question, or help to swell the rising tide of freedom. This work is valuable in one aspect, as it clearly shows that these tendencies towards liberty, are but the legitimate result of influences evolved from Christianity itself. It reveals the power that has been at work among the nations of the earth, disenthraling the human mind, and preparing the people to rise in their might and break off the double fetters of kingcraft and priestcraft in which they have

so long been held. This it does by developing the republican tendencies of the life, teachings, and death of Christ, and the republican constitution of the primitive church. In the subsequent chapters the author deals some heavy blows against kings, priests, bishops, popes, and all the powers and potentates, temporal and spiritual, whose authority has been exerted to crush, enslave, and degrade the masses.

Had the author merely sought popularity, he might have expressed himself in more measured terms, and softer language. But it is refreshing sometimes to find a writer that "speaks right on;" telling us in unambiguous language just what he means. It is a work that will be read, and, we trust, will exert a good influence.

3. *Theological Writings of Dr. Tyng.* "*The Law and the Gospel:*" "*The Israel of God:*" and "*Christ is All.*" Three 8 vo. volumes. By REV. S. H. TYNG, D.D. New York: Carters, 1848, 1849.

The careful observer of the signs of the times cannot fail to notice with lively interest those manifestations of regard for gospel truth which occasionally appear in the several denominations of professed disciples of the Saviour in our country. That very latitude of religious freedom which is here enjoyed, tending, on the one hand, as may be feared, to undue laxness of estimation for the truth once delivered to the saints, may reasonably be relied on to stimulate, on the other hand, to sleepless vigilance and holy fidelity in guarding the sacred entrenchments of the gospel from profane invasion. We doubt not that, on the whole, truth will be more effectually preserved in the midst of this freedom of individual investigation and profession, than it is where surrounded for its maintenance by the forms of dead orthodox creeds, and the enclosure of state patronage and privilege. In the various churches, it is manifest that the truth as it is in Jesus can only be preserved by constant vigilance, just as in our free republican governments, "eternal watchfulness is the price of liberty." These considerations may well warrant an occasional visit into the enclosure of our neighbors, to mark and learn their progress and present state of adherence to what we deem the fundamental truths of gospel revelation.

For various reasons which we need not now stop to enumerate and explain, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States may be regarded by us all with peculiar solicitude. Its early planting, its lofty claims, its rich endowments, the rank and influence of its comparatively small membership, may well turn the regards of its neighbors towards it. We trust that in our own case it is with no unbrotherly spirit that we turn aside for a few moments, not to look upon the nakedness, or sympathize in the adversity and downfall of our neighbor, but cordially to rejoice in whatever is lovely and of good report, which may be flourishing in his enclosure.

There was a time, not very far back, when indications less cheering met the eye from this quarter. Arminianism, in doctrine engrafting itself but too naturally on the baptismal regeneration and cumbrous lifeless formalism of this body, threatened its rapid approximation to whatever of frigid repulsiveness is seen in so many of the

professedly Reformed Churches, established by law in the old world. Thanks be unto God, while the enemy seemed coming in like a flood in that direction, * the Spirit of the Lord has lifted up a standard against him in another. Not a few of Christ's servants, valiant for the truth, have been raised up, to stand in the breach and do battle manfully for the cause of our Divine Master, and the religious interests with which they were identified. Milnor, mentioned with appropriate commendation in our last number of the Review, with his biographer of kindred spirit, and many more of similar character both among the dead and the living, might be enumerated as having borne honorable part in this good service.

Perhaps no two of those still living have been more useful in this respect than Bishop Mellvaine and Dr. Tyng. It was our privilege, near thirty years since, to know them both somewhat intimately, as they were rectors of small neighboring parishes in Georgetown, D. C.; nor have we ever failed to trace their subsequent career with interest, and, we hope, with profound gratitude to Him from whom cometh every good and perfect gift. The one rose early and rapidly, passing through the stations of chaplain to Congress, the professorship and chaplaincy at West Point, and a rectorship in Brooklyn, New York, to the prelacy which he now holds, connected for some time with the presidency of Gambia College, Ohio. The latter rose more slowly, but with steady progress, and now holds a station as the successor of Dr. Milnor, second in influence, we presume, to that of no rector of a single congregation in this country.

We turn from this too long prologue, to the presentation of a brief exhibit of what is more naturally indicated by the heading of this notice. Let us give our readers some brief account of the three beautiful volumes above named. The first volume consists of a series of lectures on the law and the gospel, delivered by the author in the autumn of 1831, to the congregation worshipping in St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, of which he was then the rector. They were first printed in the Christian Library, sixteen years ago, and have passed through several editions since. They are intended and adapted to give a clear and popular manifestation of the divine law and the gospel of Christ, both in their intrinsic characters, and in their relations to each other, to God, to mankind, and to other and less intimately concerned orders of moral intelligences. There is in such a field very little to awaken or call forth the exercise of the higher order of inventive genius. The sober guidance of Bible truth seems to have been rigidly adhered to; and the result has been a very safe and useful volume, which may be perused by all who desire a methodical development of this great and practically important theme. Dr. Tyng acknowledges his special indebtedness for the views contained in this volume to some of the writings of the venerable Simeon, of Cambridge; and there will be found a general harmony in their views and sentiments. We have long thought, and such seems to be the idea of this

* We would not presume to turn interpreters of the judgments of God; but certainly the downfall of three neighboring Bishops, of three contiguous dioceses in the Middle States, in such rapid succession — the very heart of the Puseyite movement in this country, — is an indication which should not be passed by unnoticed.

author, that correct views of the law of God cut up by the roots that Arminian laxness which demands a portion of the grace of God to make any one a free agent; and that antinomian indulgence which in fact takes away from all men, both saints and sinners, all the responsibility of such agency. Generally, we regard the views here exhibited remarkably judicious, and always seasonable.

The second of the volumes above mentioned, — entitled, with no very special appropriateness that we have been able to discover, “The Israel of God,” — contains twenty-six sermons preached by the author to his people at various periods of his ministry. Though we might reasonably have anticipated a different and more favorable result, in a selection from the vast aggregate of discourses from this highly esteemed preacher, we are really less pleased and profited by the volume, than with either of the others. Perhaps this selection furnishes another illustration of what has often been remarked before, that an author often egregiously mistakes in the estimate which he puts on his own performances. Some merely incidental and purely adventitious circumstances may make certain treatises or sermons favorites with their author, while in fact they fall far below the average excellence of his performances.

The plan of the last three discourses in this volume is a fair indication of its excellencies and what we think its faults. They are all entitled “The Gospel the only Rock,” and all have one and the same text, Mat. 7: 24, 25, the close of Christ’s memorable sermon on the mount. The plan is, in the first discourse, to *assume* the truth of the gospel, and reason with men on that assumption, which occasionally is both allowable and useful. The second discourse takes lower ground as its basis, and proceeds to reason with the hearers on the ground of the gospel being *probably* true. Even this, in skillful hands, like some of bishop Butler’s reasonings in his incomparable *Analogy*, may be tolerated. But then the third discourse has this strange design: “Allowing the supposition that as a divine revelation the gospel is utterly a false pretence — it is still wise in man to receive and adopt it, and equally foolish in him to despise and reject it.” “It is,” says the reverend author, “my present purpose to manifest the wisdom of those who embrace the gospel, and love it, and cling to it, though it be considered merely a *system of man’s device*.” What else this could be than making lies, instead of truth, our refuge and our trust, is very difficult to conceive. When did Christ or Paul ever preach a whole sermon on the assumption that their message from God was only a cunningly devised fable of men? This discourse, even with this very bad aim, as we cannot but regard it, may some how or other, directly or indirectly, have been the occasion of good to some souls; and the excellent author from too narrow an induction, may have committed the blunder of the empiric, taking the exception for the rule, and he thus holds forth this example to mislead others, in the prominent place where it here stands. From what we know of his judiciousness, we do not think such mistakes are frequent in his practice. Another reason why this discourse was published may have been, the vigorous spirit in which it is written, indicating an unusual degree of the power of mental conception and combination. This consciousness may have been so unusually perceptible to the author’s conviction, that he was unwilling to sacrifice the appearance of so distinguished a production, notwithstand-

ing the faultiness of its plan. Nearly the whole of this infelicity might have been avoided, had the same discourse, with some few omissions, been preached from the first part of the apostle's testimony, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come;" or the profitableness for this life of conformity to God's requirements. In the discussion of this theme nearly all the argument and illustration of this sermon would find appropriate place.

The last of the volumes, "Christ is All," seems to us the one better adapted than either of the others, to evince the genius of Dr. Tyng. It is divided into three parts of about equal length; the first, in ten chapters, treats of *the believer in Christ*, that is, in a state of grace or acceptance with God, through the Redeemer, *in the present life*. These chapters begin with "Retrospection," and end with "Oneness in Christ." In the intermediate parts, the enjoyment, hope, security, honor, &c., is treated of in such a manner as to exalt the riches of divine grace through the Saviour.

The second part, in much the same way, treats of the relations of the glorified in heaven to the Saviour, or the believer with Christ. Here, too, there is ample scope for the varied and gifted powers of the author. Beginning with the *rest* of the glorified, he goes on to speak of their *holiness*, their *heavenly joy, worship*, and *beholding their Saviour's glory*. Those best acquainted with the glowing intensity of thought and expression to which Dr. T. frequently rises, may conceive of these portions. Then in part third, we have the state of those without Christ, both here and hereafter. Their difficulties, contests, unhappiness, dangers, guilt, and awful anticipations. Depicting such a one, he says: "He is alone in the midst of a multitude. Without sympathy or support, he sinks into the abyss of eternal sorrow and despair. He has this at the Lord's hands, that he lies down in sorrow. A fearful, awful doom! O may every reader think of it, and flee from it,—AN ETERNITY WITHOUT CHRIST!"

Nothing of this kind which has met our eye since Jay's Lectures on "The Christian Contemplated,"—which have been so popular and useful in this country, as well as in England,—strikes us as finer than the conception, and many parts of the execution of this volume. May the writer (for this volume, unlike the two preceding, lays aside the forms of homiletic address, and paints to the eye and the heart of *the reader*, rather than appeals to *the hearer*,) be long spared, worthily to fill the important post where God's providence has placed him; to rebuke with fearlessness the depravity and folly of the great commercial metropolis of this western world, and to lead many sons and daughters unto glory. We cannot but commend his writings generally, for their judicious and earnest illustration and enforcement of what we regard as the fundamental principles of gospel truth. He is not, indeed, so extra Calvinistic as some few would desire; does not, any more than the Institutes of the great Genevan himself, teach a limited and partial atonement; but the lovers of Bible truth will generally acquiesce in his sentiments. His views of the ordinances of Christ and the general principles of church building, we fear will not be found so generally unexceptionable.

4. *A Classical Atlas, to illustrate Ancient Geography, comprising, in twenty-five Maps, the various divisions of the world, as known to the ancients: with an Index of the Ancient and Modern names.* By ALEXANDER G. FINDLAY, F. R. G. S. New York: Harpers. 1849.

In this beautiful imperial 8 vo. volume, we have the most complete and reliable directory to a true acquaintance with ancient geography which we have ever met with. The maps are elegant specimens of engraving, evincing the utmost care, on the part of the author, to gather from every source the most accurate knowledge of whatever the ancients understood, and spread it out before us. Not only does the atlas embrace all the topics of interest to the classical scholar; Biblical Geography has also its full share of attention. The four maps of Egypt, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria, will be specially welcome to theological students. Indeed, the whole volume is one which, having once possessed, the student would scarcely part with, at any price. The alphabetical index, in the end, comprised in 44 pages of very close letter press, furnishes the means of easy alphabetical reference to about 13,000 names of places, and gives the direct guide to their place on the map.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DIED.

- Rev. James Whitstitt, Mill Creek, Tenn., April 12, aged 79.
 Rev. Z. Bradford, Providence, R. I., May 16.
 Rev. G. W. Cate, Barre, Ms., May 13.
 Rev. Matthew Winfree, Chesterfield, April 25, aged 68.
 Rev. Elijah Ray, Union District, S. C., April 11, aged 42.
 Rev. W. S. Wheaton, Cincinnati, O., May 25.
 Rev. John Pettes, Rush, Susquehanna Co., Pa., June 3.
 Rev. James Dupre, Sumpterville, June 18, aged 36.
 Rev. Elliott Estes, Barnwell District, S. C., June 9, aged 57.

CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

- At Charleston, S. C., April 6.
 " Tarrytown, N. J., May 24.
 " Spring Creek, Houston Co., Geo., May 3.
 " Marion, Jennings Co. Ia., April 26.
 " Yonkers, N. Y., May 24.
 " Ashford, Ct.
 " Towanda, Erie Co., N. Y., May 15.
 " Rose Hill Church, N. Y., May 27.
 " Dennisville, N. J., June 6.

ORDINATIONS.

- Peter B. Houghout, Hudson, Mich., May 13.
 Alexander H. Spilman, Liberty, Va., April 24.

- Richard Gerard, Laight street church, New York, April 27.
 Wm. Cornell, Ovid, N. Y., April 25.
 J. A. W. Thomas, Salem church, Marlboro' District, S. C., April 15.
 Wm. S. Parrish, Foster's Creek, Louisa Co. Va., May 12.
 G. W. Johnston, Norfolk, Va., May 7.
 T. G. Jones, Norfolk, Va., May 16.
 J. A. Hill, Newbury District, S. C., April 28.
 Wm. Ellis, Goshen, Pa., May 9.
 Prof. Henry Day, Providence, R. I., June 6.
 James E. Crawford, Nantucket, June 6.
 G. W. Ford, Bradford, Wis., May 2.
 David Jewell, Hanson, Me., May 30.
 Wm. W. Whittier, Tremont, Me., May 30.
 George H. Clarke, [Richmond, R. I., June 12.
 C. T. Tucker, N. Marshfield, Mass., June 14.
 J. M. Symonds, Amesbury, Ms., June 14.
 R. G. Lamb, Andover, Ct., May 30.
 —. Paterson, Charlestown, Ms., June.

DEDICATIONS.

- At Canton, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y., Feb. 8.
 " Williamsburgh, N. Y., June 1.
 " Dixon, Ill., May 6.
 " N. Adams, Ms., June 21.
 " Ann Arbor, Mich.